THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VIII MARCH, 1924 No. 45

EDITORIAL

We publish this month an article from the Dean of King's College, Cambridge, which represents what is in general very much our own outlook on the *ethos* of the English Church and on its future development. But there is one feature in Fr. Knox's book, from which the article takes its start, which has hardly received in the reviews the attention it deserves. While Fr. Knox writes with sympathy of the success of Roman methods, his attitude to fundamental questions of authority is anything but that which is common in Roman circles. For him the basis of doctrinal authority is not the pronouncements of the Vatican, but the broad stream of religious experience embodied in the Church Catholic. We need not, however, pursue the matter further, as we hope that he will be speaking for himself in our pages shortly.

By the death of the Dean of Carlisle the Church of England loses one of its ablest writers and most learned divines. As historian of mediæval Universities, as moral philosopher, and as theologian, he showed an honesty and vigour of mind which were at once an example and a challenge to those who differed from him. Of late years he had become the intellectual leader of the Modernist movement; and his death following so hard upon Mr. Emmet's must appreciably affect its influence. None could read his recent work on Christology without feeling that here was a mind which was endeavouring to think the thoughts of the Church about our Lord, and to express them in modern terms; and if he failed to compass the full faith of the Incarnation or the Atonement, it was rather because of the conception of God which he had derived from his philosophy than from any desire to abandon or make light of the authority of Christian

dogma. Minds of his type, loving truth and imbued with moral enthusiasm, and combined, as his was, with a sincere spirit of personal piety, have their own light and their own witness to give; and their work lives after them, perhaps in other forms than they had planned. May he rest in the Truth he sought.

It is not often that books for Lent reading come from the greatest minds of the Church; and it was a happy thought which made the Bishop of London ask the Dean of St. Paul's to contribute to the Church's library of the inner life. *Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion** takes its place in the choice shelf of books which are not only guides to the spiritual life but also *documents humains*, and indeed all the better guides because they are so. Here the platonic note of illumination, and the shrewd practical note of faith which rings through the Bible, come to us on the lips of a child, his own daughter, Paula, who died last year at the age of eleven. The concluding pages describe her life and death in words which will bring inspiration and comfort to many. Some things there are which the father could not bring himself to write in English prose; and these are given in a Latin elegy which recalls the best and sweetest measures of Catullus:

illa meum complexa caput, " pater optime," dixit,
" Scisne, pater, quantum te tua filia amat ?"

* * * * *

respice nos, si fas illic meminisse tuorum,
aspectu frueris qua propiore Dei,
at, pater, immerito cui pascere contigit agnam
in gremium qualem tollere Christus amat,
quod Dominus donavit et imputat accipe munus;
abreptam noli plangere; disce sequi.

A frontispiece shows a child's face of mysterious beauty, as of one who has seen the invisible things. Truly she " being dead yet speaketh."

* Longmans. 2s. 6d. net.

SOME RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

III.—THE RIGHTEOUS SUFFERER

NEARLY twenty years ago Dr. Jastrow was able to draw attention to certain Babylonian fragments which seemed to be closely parallel in their subject to the Hebrew Book of Job; but, unfortunately, all the tablets dealing with the theme were much damaged, while our knowledge of the language had not at that time advanced sufficiently to render their interpretation by any means certain. Dr. Ball and Professor Gray, however, in their recent commentaries on the Book of Job, were able to make use of this material and to point out that it sufficed to prove that the story of the Righteous Sufferer was current in Babylonia long before that book took its present shape. But again, as in the case of the Babylonian Epic of Creation, the work of the German excavators at Ashshur has made it possible so to fill in the gaps as to enable scholars to give a coherent account of the Babylonian version of the story. Professor Langdon has collected all the known fragments and made them available to English students in his recently published *Babylonian Wisdom*.

The poem, it is now clear, consisted of four tablets. Of Tablet I. it is to be regretted that very little has been preserved or so far identified, amounting to not more than 20 fragmentary lines. Tablet II. has now been completely restored by joining together two fragments in the British Museum, and utilizing one tablet recovered from Ashshur and another found by Fr. Scheil at Sippar; in all, it contains 120 lines. Most of Tablet III. can be restored in the same way from two tablets, the one found at Ashshur and the other at Sippar; the combination of these two documents appears to give the whole of Tablet III. except the last 20 or 25 lines. The restoration of Tablet IV. is less satisfactory; for, although two tablets from Ashshur evidently contain parts of it, their obverses and reverses do not appear to be continuous. In addition to the text itself, portions of a commentary also are known, from which it is at times possible to repair the text of the poem. The existence of a commentary on a poem, of which the extant fragments cannot be much older than the seventh century B.C., makes it likely that the original work was much older and also much studied in the theological schools of the period. The

poem is, it should be noticed, in a rhythm of four beats upon four:

kábtát qâtsú : úl alí' našášá
("Heavy was his hand; I could not bear it");

whereas the Hebrew poet wrote in a metre marked by three beats upon three which runs through the greater part of the book.

The poem opens with the words which were used by the Babylonians as its title:

"I will praise the lord of wisdom." (I. 1)

This wisdom is the mystical knowledge possessed by the priests and enchanters of Babylon and the magic power whereby they were enabled to release man from the bonds of sin; this power they possessed through Ea, the god of water, who was the "lord of wisdom." After this there is a long gap in which, it is probable, the historical position of the Righteous Sufferer and the circumstances of his sudden *peripeteia* or reversal of fortune were explained. In the next fragment the sufferer is himself speaking:

"Although I was mighty, I am become a slave;
The frenzy of a companion has undone me," (I. 13-14)

and after a gap of about two lines:

". . . in the assembly he has cursed me;
At the mention of my prosperity his mouth is a gaping cavern,"
(I. 18-19)

that is, his mouth is uttering slander against his friend, just as Job complains, saying: "My brethren have dealt deceitfully as a brook" (vi. 15) that dries up; and again: "My kinsfolk have failed me and my familiar friends have forgotten me" (xix. 14). The sufferer's plight is indeed miserable:

"The day was sighing (and) the night weeping,
The month was lamentation (and) the year sorrow," (I. 20-21)

expressed in words not unlike those of Job, who complained:

"So am I made to possess months of vanity,
And wearisome nights are appointed unto me." (VII. 3)

This is all that has been preserved of Tablet I. In Tablet II. the Righteous Sufferer, whose name we learn to be Tâbi-utul-Enlil, an inhabitant of Nippur (iii. 25), recites his misfortunes and his treatment at the hands of his god. He begins with the following words:

"I have reached the allotted (span of) life, I have passed (it),"
(II. 1)

and, like Job, his soul is weary of life (*cf.* Job x. 1):

" Wherever I turn, there is evil upon evil;
Violence increases against me and I see not justice," (II. 2-3)

so that, in the words of Job (iv. 1): " I am not at ease, neither am I quiet, neither have I rest; but trouble cometh."

Then Tâbi-utul-Enlil tells how he called upon his god and his goddess, and how, like Nebuchadrezzar, he invoked in vain the wisdom of the seers and magicians to explain the reason for which he was thus tormented:

" I have called upon the god, (but) he showed me not his face;
I have prayed unto Ishtar, (but) her head was not raised up unto me ";
(II. 4-5)

so Yahweh was wont to hide his face from them that called upon him, so that Job cried out in bitterness: " Wherefore hidest thou thy face ?" (xiii. 24). Then:

" The diviner determined not the future;
With offering and enquiry of the dead he settled not my case.
I asked the soothsayer, (but) he opened not mine ears;
The charmer by rituals loosed not the god's wrath against me.
What perverse things are there everywhere !" (II. 6-19)

He continues his lament, how he is pursued by misfortune like one who has forgotten his duty towards his god:

" I looked and lo ! trouble is pursuing after me,
As one that observed not faithfully the libations,
Nor called on (the name of) Ishtar at meat,
Nor bowed down his face nor learned humility,
In whose mouth prayer and supplication were withheld,
(With whom) the day of the god had ceased and sacrifices grown few,
(Who) neglected and despised their commands
Nor taught his people to fear and to show reverence,
(Who) called not on (the name of) his god but (ate) his meat,
(Who) forsook Ishtar and was heedless (?)" (II. 11-20)

Yet, although he fared as one that " took in vain the name of his honoured god " (ii. 22), he, like Job (ix. 21; xiii. 18), knew himself righteous:

" But I myself was mindful of prayer and supplication;
Supplication was my custom, sacrifice my rule.
The day of the worship of the gods was the gladness of my heart,
The day of offering to Ishtar was my wealth (and my) riches ";
(II. 23-46)

No less could Job say: " My foot hath held fast to his steps; his way have I kept and turned not aside (xxiii. 11). Further, Tâbi-utul-Enlil has enjoined upon his followers respect for the king:

" I likened the praise of the king to (that of) the god
And I taught men respect for the palace." (III. 31-32)

This is followed by a couplet on the different values set upon things by a god and by a man:

" What is good to oneself is worthless before a god,
What is despicable unto him (*i.e.*, man) is good unto a god."
(II. 34-35)

These two verses assist the transition to the next passage, which closely resembles several in Job concerning the inscrutable wisdom of God:

" Who understands the purpose of the gods in the midst of the heavens ?
The counsel of the god is full of knowledge. Who understands (it) ?
Where have pale-faced men understood the way of the god ?"
(II. 36-38)

Man's life is too short to compass such knowledge:

" He that lived yesterday is dead to-day;
Quickly is he cast into darkness, suddenly is he overwhelmed ";
(II. 39-40)

or, in other words, " he cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down " (Job xiv. 2), or perishes suddenly in the night, like men who " in a moment die, even at midnight " (Job xxxiv. 20). This passage closes with a couplet on the futility of men's ambitions which is curiously reminiscent of the Tower of Babel:

" In prosperity they speak of ascending into heaven;
They are in trouble and they talk of going down to Irkalla "—
(II. 46-47)

namely, the abode of the dead.

The next fifteen lines are much mutilated, but it is clear that evil spirits and diseases attack him:

" They tear my breast, they rend my neck." (II. 61)

He is overwhelmed with sickness and plague, and

" Mine eyes look but see not,
Mine ears are open but hear not "; (II. 73-74)

and again, as Job bewails that " my flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; my skin closeth up and breaketh out afresh " (vii. 5), so Tâbi-utul-Enlil complains:

" From lack of food mine appearance is . . .;
My flesh is flabby, my blood . . .
My bones are broken, my skin (?) is . . .;
My muscles are swollen, my limbs (?) are jaundiced," (II. 91-94)

as Job was able to say: " In the night season my bones are corroded (ii. 91-94), and drop away from me " (xxx. 17);

and " My bowels boil and rest not " (xxx. 27); and a little later: " My skin is black and falleth from me, and my bones are burned with heat " (xxx. 30).

Meanwhile, like the gadfly of Greek mythology,

" All day the pursuer pursues me;
In the night-season he suffers me not for a moment to breathe ";
(II. 102-103)

with which should be compared Job's complaint that—

" He will not suffer me to take my breath, but filleth me with bitterness." (IX. 18)

Worse is to follow:

" Through wrenching are my cords loosed;
My limbs are dislocated (and) move out of joint." (II. 104-105)

The first of these two lines is couched in words almost identical with those of the Hebrew pessimist: " The silver cord be loosed " (Eccl. xii. 6).

The rest of Tablet II. goes on to tell how he lay in his own dung, how the priests failed to diagnose his sickness by magic or divination, how his god and his goddess came not to his aid nor heard him; and finally he exclaims:

" The grave was opened for me," (II. xi. 4)

almost in the same words as Job, who cried out: " The grave is ready for me " (xvii. 1). Then he tells how his enemies rejoiced at his downfall: " All my countrymen said: ' How is he put to shame ! ' "

" Mine adversary heard (of it and) his countenance grew bright;
It was told unto her that was mine adversary (and) her soul was gladdened." (II. 116-118)

Thus Tâbi-utul-Enlil learns that " there is contempt for misfortune " (Job xii. 5), and that his enemies exult over him, even as Job learned the same lesson: " They (*i.e.*, the ungodly) have gaped upon me with their mouth; they have smitten me upon the cheek reproachfully; they gather themselves together against me " (xvi. 10). But at the climax he rises superior to his misfortunes and reasserts his belief in the mercy of his gods:

" But I know the day when my tears shall cease,
A day of the grace of the protecting spirits, (when) their godhead will be merciful ";
(II. 119-120)

So, too, Job was able from the depths of misery to cry: " But I know that my vindicator liveth " (xix. 25).

Tablet III. describes the vindicator of Tâbi-utul-Enlil:

" Heavy was his hand (that) I could not bear it
Mighty was his terror (that) I . . ." (III. 1-2)

beginning almost in the words of the Psalmist: " Thy hand was heavy upon me " (Psalm xxxii. 4). The next few lines are mutilated, but after the gap we learn that:

" Tall was he in stature, glorious was [his] form." (III. 6)

This figure seems to have appeared to Tâbi-utul-Enlil in a dream:

In sleep there appeared a dream in two parts:
" A hero there was, surpassing in build,
(Who) was glorious in shape, clad in new (?) raiment." (III. 8-9)

The rest of the first dream is lost. In the second dream he saw a figure holding the implements of a purificatory rite, who stood over him, saying:

" O Tâbi-utul-Enlil, inhabitant of Nippur,
For thy cleansing has he (*i.e.*, Marduk) sent me." (III. 25-26)

Then:

" He placed water upon me;
He cast upon me the incantation of life and brightened my . . .;
I saw (that) the evil was overcome." (III. 27-30)

A third dream did he see, in which a maid, bright and gloriously apparelled, came before him and promised that mercy should be shown to him. Lastly, in yet another dream, one of the deified kings of old entered, crowned but robed like a magician, to announce that it was Marduk who had sent him. And so, the tablet records:

" He speedily put an end to my sickness, . . .
After the heart of my lord had been soothed,
The soul of Marduk the shepherd was appeased;
. . . he accepted my prayers," (III. 48-51)

and after a few mutilated lines in which Marduk ordains mercy for the sufferer, the obverse of Tablet III. closes with the words:

" He caused the wind to bear my sins away." (III. 59)

The reverse of the tablet then tells how Marduk removed each plague which had stricken down the sufferer, and the end, which is restored from the commentary, runs in the following words:

" On the bank of the river where the judgment of men is proved,
I was made clean on the forehead, I was rid of the marks of bondage "
(Comm. ii. 30-32)

namely, the mark of a slave which was set on the forehead was removed, and

> "I came forth from distress by the ritual of redemption,"
> (Comm. ii. 35)

and

> "Marduk took away the sorcery of mine oppressor and turned aside his darts." (Comm. ii. 40)

The remaining fragments, which seem, when put together, to have constituted Tablet IV., are an eulogy on Marduk:

> "He smote the hand of mine oppressor,
> Marduk brake his weapon," (A., 11-12)

as the Lord "breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder" (Psalm xlvi. 9). Then:

> "Who gave life unto him when dying save Marduk,
> What goddess but Zarpânit bestowed upon him the breath of life?
> Marduk can bring back to life from the grave;
> Zarpânit has sought to deliver from the pit." (A., 10-13)

Zarpânit was the consort of Marduk. Through their aid, says Tâbi-utul-Enlil,

> "I who went down into the grave have returned unto Babylon,"
> (B., 3)

and found life and renewed prosperity, as "the Lord turned the captivity of Job when he prayed for his friends; and the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before" (xlii. 10).

Tâbi-utul-Enlil, then, like the Hebrew Job, suddenly fell from his high estate into the depths of misery, he was struck down by disease and became an object of mockery to his friends and enemies alike, while the priests and magicians failed him. He arraigns the justice of his god and proclaims his innocence; but his outlook is that of a man who has fulfilled the formal rites prescribed by his religion. Of the ethical aspect he, unlike Job, has no conception, although he does once complain that he found no justice amongst men. Yet he feels sure that the good man will ultimately receive his due reward after suffering here on earth; and indeed he is restored to prosperity, as was also Job. But, unlike the latter, who looked to see his reward beyond the grave, the Babylonian sufferer makes no endeavour to discuss or to discover the meaning of pain, and his outlook is purely materialistic. Babylonians had little hope of any reward after death to requite them for misery and injustice in this world; for them Arallû, the land beyond the grave, was a land of gloom and darkness in the heart of the earth-mountain where the souls of men reposed for ever in a state of

somnolence. Even this repose was denied, as it was by the Romans, to those whose bodies had not been buried with due rites; and even for those so buried eternal rest depended largely on the regularity with which their descendants kept the feasts of the dead with libations and offerings. Such being their belief about the next world, it is little wonder that the Babylonians held that *fortuna virtuti comes*, and that this virtue consisted largely in winning the goodwill of the gods during their lifetime by ceremonial observances. It was not, it may be added, till the Persian period that the hope of divine intervention on behalf of the soul in "the land of tears" became an accepted article of belief. A small collection of tablets found at Susa shows that at that time the Babylonians had come to modify their earlier creed by a belief in a future judgment and a system of rewards and punishments.

The Babylonian differs from the Hebrew poem, however, not only in its theological and ethical outlook, in spite of the general similarity of the subjects and occasionally striking resemblances even in isolated phrases, but also in literary style; the Babylonian poem is uncouth and stiff and destitute of any literary charm or grace and cannot therefore be for a moment compared to the Hebrew Job, which is one of the greatest works of all time. Further, they disagree in many of their details. Dr. Gray points out that the names of the persons and their countries, the topography, the rank of the sufferer are all different; the Babylonian poem is a monologue, whereas the Hebrew is made up of a combination of narrative and discourse. As regards the subject, the Hebrew sufferer is convinced of his own innocence, and Yahweh himself asserts the perfection of Job's character; the problem for the latter is to reconcile his own integrity and Yahweh's justice with his undeserved afflictions. The Babylonian sufferer, on the contrary, is by no means sure that, however punctilious he has been in the observance of his religious duties, he may not have committed some sin displeasing to the gods, and in fact he admits more or less clearly that he has done amiss; the problem for him, then, is to discover what this sin is which has brought such sufferings upon himself and to appease the gods for it. The two poems cannot, therefore, be regarded as in any way closely connected, but both represent endeavours made by peoples, different in religion, but closely akin in race, to solve one of the oldest and greatest of mysteries, the problem of undeserved suffering.

G. R. Driver.

SIN, SUFFERING, AND THE ATONEMENT*

It can hardly be denied that the question of God's relation to the sin and suffering of the world is the most fundamental, and for many people to-day the most important, of all religious problems. Jesus came to reveal the nature of God as that of a Father, and while there is any lingering doubt of the goodness and mercy of God there can be no healthy development of spiritual life. Yet it cannot be denied that the spectacle of sin and suffering which the world presents, and has always presented throughout the whole of human history, does constitute a very real difficulty to many earnest and thoughtful persons who would be religious if they could. This attitude of mind was well illustrated by the words of a working man who in the early days of the war, speaking at the close of a dinner-hour address in a Manchester workshop, said: "I wonder how any parson can have the face to stand up and preach about a heavenly Father with things going on the way they are. Do you think, if I were almighty, I'd let men and women, aye, and innocent little children too, suffer as they are suffering to-day?"

The question is as old as human nature:

> "We look on helplessly.
> There the old misgivings, crooked questions are—
> This good God—what He could do, if He would,
> Would, if He could—then must have done long since:
> If so, when, where, and how?

But old as the question is, and often as it has been asked, I am sure it is not as unanswerable as most people suppose. Let us see if we can find an answer which may in any way help us.

"*Could do, if He would; would if He could.*" Clearly the question is one of God's power. Well! what is possible to an omnipotent being? Most readers will at once reply, "Everything, surely." But can we, need we, say that? For instance, does the reader believe that an omnipotent God could *at one and the same time* create him, and abstain from creating him, so that the reader would both exist and not exist? If anyone wishes to say Yes he need not hesitate to do so. He will be in excellent company. That was, apparently, the opinion of Plotinus. It was certainly the view of Eckhart, and many others of the mediæval mystics, and Professor McTaggart says

* The substance of a paper delivered at the Anglo-Catholic Congress at Bristol, November 28, 1923.

that if we ascribe omnipotence to God at all that is the sense in which we must ascribe it. But if the reader takes up this position there are two things which he is logically bound to admit—namely:

(i.) That there is no longer any Problem of Evil since, if God can do everything, He can create millions of sentient beings, condemn them to eternal torments for no fault of theirs, *and make this a proof of mercy and justice.*

(ii.) There is no longer any use in thinking, still less in speaking, about God, since anything not subject to the "Law of Contradiction" is not a possible object of thought. For if the truth of the statement, "Bath is nearer to Bristol than Manchester is," does not exclude the possibility that the statement, "Bath is not nearer to Bristol than Manchester is," is also true, neither statement means anything, and we might just as well not have spoken.

We must, therefore, reject the view that God's omnipotence is of the type known as "Unlimited Omnipotence."

Must we then go to the opposite extreme and, denying that God is in any sense omnipotent, accept the view, championed by Mr. G. B. Shaw, and Mr. H. G. Wells, of a *God Who is doing His best*, but Who is hampered by forces which are too strong for him? Surely not. Mr. Shaw and Mr. Wells are doubtless very brilliant and original thinkers, but a very slight knowledge of the history of theology and of philosophy would have taught them that the hypothesis of a non-omnipotent God is one which creates more difficulties, and worse difficulties, than those it is invoked to solve. Theological and philosophical speculation for the last twenty-five centuries has not been a vain ploughing of the sand. Some solid results have been gained, and as Lord Balfour truly says, "Over some alluring paths 'No Thoroughfare' has been writ so large that even the boldest explorer must pause and turn." Well! the theory of a non-omnipotent God is such a "No Thoroughfare." It would be a fascinating task to explore it, and to display the morasses of contradiction into which it leads. But it would take us too far from our proper subject. It will be enough to say that, even if it really helped to solve any of our difficulties, (which it does not), it has been definitely rejected by the Church. The Christian says, "I believe in God, the Father, *Almighty* . . ."

Of what nature, then, is God's omnipotence? It is the only sort of omnipotence worth having or worth talking about —namely, a "Rational Omnipotence." God, being perfect Holiness, can do everything which would not be morally wrong; being perfect Love, can do everything which would not be cruel;

and being Wisdom, can do everything which would not be absurd—*i.e.*, which would not involve a contradiction. Now this Rational Omnipotence is clearly the only omnipotence worth having, or talking about, since a God whose Holiness did not prevent Him from being vile, or His Love exclude hatred and cruelty, or His Wisdom render the absurd and irrational impossible for Him, would truly be, in Eckhart's words, "Super-essential Nothingness." And also it is clearly the sort of omnipotence which we find described in the Bible, for we read of God that "He cannot deny Himself" (2 Tim. ii. 13), and of the impossibility that God should lie (Heb. vi. 18).

Now without attempting to draw out in detail all the things which would involve a contradiction, and so prove impossible for God, we may surely say that God could not create a free spiritual creature and force him to choose virtue. For virtue, says Aristotle, is "a habit of choice," and the very notion of choice involves freedom from constraint. Many people have confused ideas on this point. They think that if anyone is prevented from doing what he wishes his freedom of will is interfered with. But this is clearly not so. What is constrained is not his freedom of will, but his freedom of action. An illustration may help. I once heard a fat, comfortable-looking woman in a tram discussing summer bonnets. She said to her companion: "No, my dear, I don't like this one. For my own part I fancy a bit of colour, and I'd have liked the one with the roses. But my husband is so difficult. He made me choose this one." But clearly the lady was wrong. Her husband did not make her *choose* the quieter-coloured bonnet; he made her *take* it. In her heart she still hankered after the gaudy roses. Æsthetically she was unconverted still. So with God and the human soul. If I wickedly decide to murder my brother, God, "Who ordereth all things both in heaven and earth," is not responsible for that sinful act of will, since He has given me freedom of the will. He may prevent my being successful in my wicked design. But that would not make me a virtuous man. I should still be a murderer in will, or, as we say, "at heart." Of course, God may, by the secret pleading of His Holy Spirit, speaking in my heart, or by means of some servant of His, some fellow-man, labouring with me and persuading me, lead me to repent and to relinquish my evil design. But God Himself cannot *force me to leave off wishing to commit murder, nor can He force me to begin wishing to live virtuously*. For that would either be (*a*) to do the impossible by constraining a free spiritual being to choose, whereas choice involves freedom from constraint; or (*b*) to destroy the nature of His creature by turning a free spiritual being into a machine,

and that is impossible to a God Who is Love. This is why the writer, who passes under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, says, with rare insight and soundness: "Wherefore we will not admit the vain statement of the multitude, who say that Providence ought to lead us to virtue, even against our own will. For *to destroy nature* is not a function of Providence."

Hence we may say with truth that when God created man there were only two possible alternatives before Him—namely, to create machines which could not sin, or free spiritual beings who could. This is not to say that the Fall was necessary. It is to assert that the possibility of a Fall was necessary. Where there is no choice there is no virtue; and where there is choice, there is at least the possibility of a wrong choice—*i.e.*, the choice of evil. But for God to have created a universe of machines eternally predestined to work perfectly would surely have been to miss the whole object and purpose of creation, which is the bringing into being of creatures able to be loved by God, to love Him in return, and to be, in a true sense, His "children." Indeed, it seems to me that we may say of the universe what a Jesuit said of the Society of Jesus—namely, that its object is "to cultivate an infinite number of souls." And this is an aim at once adequate and worthy of God. If the universe is not a soul factory, and its object the production of noble character, what is it, and what does it exist for? There is nothing that we know of, nothing, surely, that we can conceive of, which could be a more worthy object of God's desire than spiritual beings freely and voluntarily conformed to His own likeness. The extent to which the argument of this essay appeals to the reader will depend on the extent to which he regards moral goodness as the chief of all goods. For my own part I do not hesitate to say that Kant, when he said, "Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a Good Will," appears to me to have stated a self-evident truth. When I see a wonderfully ingenious machine, when I read of the marvels of astronomy, when I enjoy a supremely beautiful symphony or lovely poem, when I am dazzled by the glories of a sunset, I experience wonder and delight. But the feeling, the passion of admiration and love, to which I am moved when I see some poor, ill-taught, heavily tempted boy or girl steadily resisting evil, still choosing the better and rejecting the worse, is a very different thing. Surely, I say to myself, God Himself desires nothing so much as goodness.

But if the view that the whole aim and object of this world is the production of morally perfect beings in the likeness of a

God of perfect holiness is a self-evident proposition, surely it is equally self-evident that this world is very far from being as God would have it. One reason why I accept the Catholic Faith is because it alone seems to me to meet the facts of experience. Before the war we had Mr. Blatchford boisterously assuring the world that no man ever had sinned or could sin. We had Sir Oliver Lodge declaring that the "higher man of to-day" (Heaven save the mark!) was not bothering about his sins. We had Professor Bradley declaring that "'Heaven's design,' if we may speak so, can realize itself as effectively in 'Catiline or Borgia' as in the scrupulous or innocent," and that "in the Absolute" distinctions of good and evil are fused, and come together. But the fact of sin, and of its fruit, pain, and suffering, is the most striking and obvious fact of experience. And only the Christian, with his belief in sin as voluntary rebellion against God, and his doctrine of a universe deeply corrupted, groaning and travailing, yet destined to be delivered from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 21 and 22) can really face the facts of life. I must not attempt to discuss the question of the Fall here. It is too vast. I will merely assert my belief in one or two things of vital importance. They are:

(i.) That Christianity stands or falls by belief in the Fall, since it is a religion of redemption; and any view of sin which regards it as a natural incident in evolution, a stage on the road to a higher perfection, is removed as wide as the poles from the doctrine of sin as something for the cure of which the Son of God died on the Cross.

(ii.) That the failure of the Church to face the problem of the Fall in the light of new knowledge is responsible for much chaotic thinking within the Church, and much doubt and unbelief in the world.

(iii.) That the "evolutionary" doctrine of the Fall, despite the piety and learning of its chief modern exponent, Dr. Tennant, is absolutely bankrupt.*

(iv.) That whatever the Fall was, or was not, it is not the human race alone which is corrupt. The "whole creation" is involved.

If this is true (and it is unquestionably the teaching of the Catholic Church) there would seem to have been, after the Fall, only two alternatives before God. The one was to blot out the

* I have given my reasons for regarding the "evolutionary" view of the Fall as hopelessly bankrupt in Chapter VI. of my book, *The Problem of Evil* (Longmans, 1920). But the case against it, and in favour of a very different view, has been far more forcibly stated by the Rev. C. W. Formby in his book, *The Unveiling of the Fall* (Williams and Norgate, 1923), a book which, it seems to me, our theologians will have to reckon with, and which cannot be much longer ignored.

whole creation. And that was impossible to a God of Love. The other was to have long patience, and strive and plead with man, and to labour for his redemption. And that is precisely what my daily experience of myself, and of the world, leads me to believe God is doing. To the dinner-hour critic of God, mentioned in the first paragraph, I said, "All right! Fancy that you are God. Everything is possible to you except to stop men from sinning. Now tell us what improvements you would make." He thought for a moment and then said, "Well! anyway, I'd not let innocent people suffer for the faults of others." "Oh! oh! oh!" I cried. "This won't do. What are you going to do with mothers? Are we to have a world where there are no mothers, or one where mothers feel no sorrow when their children sin?" Of course, he had no answer. There is a great deal of nonsense, often profane nonsense, talked about vicarious suffering, and about the injustice of God in allowing the sins of the fathers to be visited upon the children. If one may be permitted to use the phrase, I would call vicarious suffering God's happiest device for the salvation of the world. If none could bear another's shame, or suffer for another's sin, we should have to rule out of the world mothers, and friends, and heroes, and saints, and the Cross of Christ. Self-sacrifice is not only "the passion of great souls," but a path to holiness which lies open to all. When first the topic of venereal disease was attracting public attention, a working-man said to me, "I'm no saint, and if I'd no one to think of but myself I could be as bad as anyone. But I don't want to see my dear wife with her nose ate off, nor any child of mine born blind, so I try to live a straight life." I do not say that the man was chaste for the highest and noblest reason, the love of God; I do say that he was chaste for a very high and very noble reason—the love of others—and that thought for others led him to really virtuous conduct.

No! granting that God cannot "lead us to virtue, even against our will," I doubt if the most ingenious critic of God could suggest any very obvious improvements on His dealings with a fallen world, or on His plan for its redemption.

Can we now see more clearly the nature of that plan? I think we can. If man's nature is corrupt, what does he need? Clearly a *new* nature. And this is the teaching of Holy Scripture. I find nothing in the Bible about *better* men. It is always "a new creature," "a new creation." The same Creative Spirit, the Giver of Life, Who, in the beginning created man, now creates a new humanity. First, by a new creative act He brings into the world the Second Adam (for the Son was "conceived by the Holy Ghost"), and then, when that new humanity

had undergone all that is proper to man,* He, in regeneration, conversion, and sanctification, working normally, but certainly not exclusively, in and through the Sacraments, raises up that new humanity in us. Indeed, for me, the whole plan of salvation has long been summed up in the prayer, in the Baptismal Service, "that the old Adam in this child may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in him." Goethe, in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, describes how his father, when the bye-laws of Frankfurt did not allow him, if once his old house were pulled down, to rebuild it again, decided, so to speak, to pull it up. He rebuilt it piece-meal, from the bottom story upwards, so that at no time could the Town Council say, "This is a new house you are building"; yet at the end there was no bit of the old house left, though the family had gone on living in the house all the time. Even so, when God's love will not allow Him to destroy us utterly, and put a new race in our place, He, by His Holy Spirit, remakes us, so that, though the world is forced to see in us the same men and women, yet the redeemed and sanctified man can truly say, "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). And since it would be folly indeed to do away the old nature, and then to raise up again the old nature in its place, we see why, in the Incarnation, God had to do a new thing, and by a new creative act make, in the Second Adam, a new departure for fallen humanity. And the Virgin Birth ceases to be a difficulty for faith, and is seen to be necessary, and congruous with man's needs and God's plan.

And as God's plan of Salvation, in the Incarnation and the Atonement, is satisfactory intellectually, being justified at the bar of reason, so, too, it is proved true by the experience of the moral consciousness. Any religious or social worker who has worked with individuals will have been led, sooner or later, to recognize the truth of a strange paradox, an antinomy deeply

* In considering what things are "proper to man" we must distinguish between (*a*) those necessary for unfallen man, and (*b*) those necessary for man who has fallen. The first would be (i.) to be filled with the Spirit, since man is made to be indwelt by God; hence Christ's Baptism; (ii.) to be strengthened, in the only way in which human nature can be strengthened—namely, by victorious resistance to temptation; hence "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. iv. 15); and (iii.) to pass, without pain or death, into Heaven when the time of probation is ended; hence the Transfiguration, when a way was opened to Christ, which He refused because by *that* path we could not follow Him. It was by "overcoming death" that He could open unto us the gate of everlasting life" (Collect for Easter Day).

For the second—*i.e.*, fallen man—there would be necessary (i.) penitence, suffering, and payment of the penalty to the uttermost farthing; (ii.) submission to and conquest of death. Each and all of these things would seem to be necessary for, and impossible to, fallen man. So Christ was, did, suffered, and won all man ought to be, do, suffer, and attain, and then His work is made ours by no forensic fiction but by the most fundamental of religious facts—namely, mystical union with Christ through the work of the Holy Ghost.

iooted in human nature. My space is limited, so I will state rt as baldly as possible.

(i.) If you want to save anyone you must be infinitely above those you would save; better than they morally and spiritually. "For their sakes, therefore, I sanctify myself" must be the cry of every worker, from the Sunday-school teacher in the Infant School to the prophet seeking the regeneration of a nation.

(ii.) If you want to save anyone you must *not* be above those you would save; you must be down on their level, thinking their thoughts, living their lives, striving to bear their sufferings, temptations, sins, and sorrows.

Here, surely, is the moral justification of the Incarnation. I think that not even God Himself could have saved us while He remained Himself in Heaven. He had, while remaining Very God, to become Very Man, if He desired to save us.

And I would go farther still. Thirty years' work among the very poorest has taught me that I can never help man or boy unless I care for him so much that when he sins it hurts me more than it hurts him. We smile when we hear of father saying to his little boy, as he puts him across his knee, "This is going to hurt me more than it hurts you." But this I will say—namely, that, if it does not, he is no true father, and has no right to punish, and will do the child no good. And so with God. The power of the Cross is that in it God suffers with us as well as for us and its sovereign appeal is that it hurts Him more than our sins hurt us. And anyone who really loves another, and desires his moral perfection, if he will watch himself carefully will find that what he tries to do, nay, what by the imperious force of circumstances he must try to do, for the person he loves, is just what Christ did for us all upon the Cross. And this is the moral justification of the Atonement.

Many people, claiming the title of advanced thinkers, speak as if, in order to be a Christian, a man had to do some violence to his intelligence and even hint that no intelligent man who is at once honest and educated, could accept the Creed. Personally, I find "the faith which was once delivered to the saints" equally good to believe and to live by. It seems to me to meet all the demands of our intellectual and moral nature.

PETER GREEN.

THE ATONEMENT

III.—CHRIST OUR SACRIFICE AND OBLATION

No idea is more familiar to us in connection with Christ's Death than that of Sacrifice. It is scarcely too much to say that the New Testament is saturated in it. In the Synoptic Gospels we have the much-discussed "Ransom" passage (Mk. x. 45), and Our Lord's emphatic words at the Last Supper, "This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many" (Mk. xiv. 24 and parallels). In the Apocalypse "the Lamb" is alluded to no fewer than twenty-seven times. St. Paul speaks of Christ's "blood" as the ground of our justification (Rom. v. 9; *cf.* iii. 25) and redemption (Eph. i. 7), and of the universality of the reconciliation He has wrought (Eph. ii. 15; Col. i. 20); and says boldly, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7). St. Peter speaks of His "precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish," and of its sprinkling upon us (1 Pet. i. 19, i. 2). But above all St. John and the author of Hebrews draw out the full implicates of this thought. Of Hebrews Christ's Sacrifice is the main subject. As Dr. Orr says,* it is in the Levitical system that all the ideas of Old Testament sacrifice come to clearest expression; and the purpose of this Epistle is to interpret that system as fulfilled in Christ. But we shall revert to this in detail in the sequel, and need not pause upon it now. The case of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles is different, but not less striking. For not only have we a number of overt allusions to the sacrificial character of Christ's Death (*e.g.*, 1 Jn. i. 7, ii. 1; Jn. i. 29, 36); but in countless ways not noticeable at first sight, the idea is woven into the texture of the narrative, while the framework of the idea of Atonement, which in St. Paul's writings is so largely forensic, becomes in St. John predominantly sacrificial.† Thus, the first four chapters of the Gospel are steeped in the mystery of purification, exemplified at Cana, and in the cleansing of the Temple.‡ This Evangelist's account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand is introduced by a note of time referring to the Passover (vi. 4), mentions that the loaves were of barley such as would have been suitable at the Feast, and issues in the great discourse upon Christ's Sacri-

* H. D. B., art. "Atonement."

† A forensic interpretation has been suggested for one important passage (Jn. xvi. 8 f.), where W. H. P. Hatch has urged that δικαιοσύνης = acquittal. (*Harvard Theol. Review*, January, 1921.)

‡ The point is fully worked out by E. C. Hoskyns in THEOLOGY, I. 83 ff.

fice as the Bread of Life. In recording the Entry into Jerusalem, he alone observes that the branches strewn in the way were of palm—*i.e.*, such as were carried round the altar at the Feast of Tabernacles. In telling of the Passion, St. John alone records the piercing of the Lord's side on the Cross and the outflowing of water and blood, and notes how the omission to break His legs seemed to mark Him out as the Paschal victim itself (Jn. xix. 31-37; *cf.* Ex. xii. 46). So firmly seized is he, indeed, of the sacrificial character of Jesus' Death that he parts company with long-standing tradition and makes it to synchronize with the very hour when the Passover sacrifices were slain. And, finally, we may observe how in all the Evangelic records alike the story of the Passion contrasts with the rest of the narrative in fulness and richness of detail. The disproportionate space given to the Passion and Resurrection is such as could be justified on no ordinary grounds of history or biography.* It is only explicable if writers and readers alike were men who thought of Christ's Death as consummating in some unique way the purpose and meaning of His Life and constituting the ground of His, and their, appeal to the world, and of men's approach to God.

Moreover, we have not to deal with the New Testament only. On the one hand, sacrifice is a constant feature of the life and literature of the Hebrew people from the earliest days, and appears indeed, with few exceptions, to be as widespread as religion itself. On the other, the idea persists, though purified and exalted by its application to Jesus, in the thought and practice of Christianity. When our Prayer Book refers

* The actual figures are:

	St. Matthew.	*St. Mark.*	*St. Luke.*	*St. John.*
Total number of verses ..	1,071	678	1,151	879
Number of verses from the entry into Jerusalem to the end	389	253	286	332
Percentage of last figure to the whole	36	37	25	38 (nearly)

Observe that the Marcan percentage would probably be increased if we had the original ending; and, if Canon Streeter's reconstruction of Proto-Luke holds good, the proportion there, too, would probably be normal. This very fact may possibly afford some evidence in its favour.

to His Death as a "sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction," or speaks of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as "ordained . . . for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ," it is speaking the language both of the Fathers and of the early Liturgies. The point, indeed, needs to be stressed in view of many statements which are rife to-day; as, for example, that "the Holy Sacrament was instituted by Christ for no other purpose but that we should reverently and faithfully partake of the same,"* or that the Sacrifice offered in the Eucharist is primarily the sacrifice of ourselves.† Scripture and the Church alike teach otherwise. Both Our Lord Himself at the institution, and St. Paul in interpreting Him, speak of its purpose as being "for a memorial"; while the fundamental Sacrifice, in virtue of which alone that term can be applied to the Eucharist, is the Sacrifice of Jesus on Calvary. Yet, after all, the point need not be laboured; for the popular belief of Christendom is too strong an evidence to be gainsaid. One, and one only, symbol has been used all down the ages by Christians, when they wish to commemorate the sacrifice of life: and that symbol is the Cross.

This unanimity as to the sacrificial character of Christ's Death might be supposed to simplify our task: but, in fact, it only brings us to the threshold of the problem. Popular ideas are often those that take the hardest thinking, if they are to appear rational; and they lend themselves easily to partial or premature interpretations. And the idea of sacrifice, for all its frequency on men's lips, is one that consorts ill, when used in connection with religion and worship, with much of the currency of modern thought. Most men, if asked to-day why the term sacrifice was applied to Our Lord's Death, would reply that it was because His Death afforded the most sublime spectacle of self-sacrifice ever seen; and yet they would be giving the term precisely that one among its many connotations which is least frequent in the New Testament. I do not mean that the New Testament does not bring out in sharp relief the self-sacrifice of Jesus; but when it does, it does not employ the language of sacrifice. The truth is that, for Scripture and the Church alike, the idea of sacrifice is highly complex and, in a sense, technical. No royal road leads from what they mean by it to what men commonly mean by it to-day. Connection there

* See proposed rubric in *A New Prayer Book*, Part II., p. 170.

† *Grey Book Pamphlet*, No. 4, seems here far more balanced than *G.B.P.*, No. 2; and the present writer fully agrees that Cranmer was emphasizing a most important truth in placing the Prayer of Oblation where he did. Similarly, he would agree that the purpose of the reserved Sacrament is Communion. But he cannot help feeling that, in striving to recover a just proportion of thought and practice, the *Grey Book* writers have unduly limited the meaning of Eucharistic sacrifice (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 10).

is; but it is only by analysis and development of its components that we can trace it out. And the ideas to which some of those lines of analysis lead us, though full of significance to modern minds, do not clothe themselves, for us, in the language of sacrifice at all.

This fact, moreover, dictates in large measure the method to be adopted. We must examine the significance of sacrifice as presented to us in Holy Scripture, partially and often crudely in the Old Testament, fully and finally in the New; and then endeavour to estimate the bearing of each element upon the life and thought of to-day. And three main threads which seem most plainly distinguishable in the evidence are (1) the idea of Purification; (2) the idea of the Covenant; (3) the idea of a Feast.* And at the outset we may observe that through all three elements of sacrifice there runs an important common factor. Each of them involves something *to be assimilated by man*. Purification was wrought by His Death that we might "be pure, even as He is pure": He established the Covenant in His blood, but it was that we might keep it: He gave His Life for us in sacrifice, in order that we might partake of it. In the previous article, when we considered Christ's Death as a Satisfaction for sin, we were regarding it mainly as a fact outside of us, as the necessary and dogmatic ground of the Atonement. But, conceived as a Sacrifice, the fact is more plainly seen to involve for its completeness an activity on man's part as well. It must be appropriated. It is not a question of two facts, but of two complementary aspects of the same fact: satisfaction representing the godward aspect, sacrifice the godward and manward both.

With this preface let us pass to the main divisions of our subject.

1. Purification.

There are three purificatory sacrifices of the Levitical system which the writer of Hebrews refers to in his exposition of the Sacrifice of Christ. One is the purely ceremonial sacrifice of the Red Heifer (Num. xix.; Heb. ix. 13 [xiii. 11]), whose ashes, after it had been burnt outside the camp, were mixed with running water and applied to one who had been defiled by contact with a dead body. The others are the Sin-Offering† and the ritual of the Day of Atonement.‡ Both these were expiatory sacrifices, with the idea of purification strongly stressed; but the former was so largely taken up into, and expanded in,

* The first two of these only will be dealt with in this article.

† Lev. iv. 1-v. 13, vi. 24-30, ix.; Ex. xxix. 11-14; Num. xxv. 22-29; Heb. ix. 14, xiii. 12; Rom. iii. 25 [John i. 29; 1 John i. 7].

‡ Lev. xvi., xxiii. 26-32; Num. xxix. 7-11; Heb. x., xiii. 11, 12.

the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement that we need here only concern ourselves with the latter. The ideas suggested by these rites occur frequently in Hebrews, and are often combined, in one passage or even in one verse, with ideas derived from other types of sacrifice—a fact, indeed, which throughout complicates the exegesis of this Epistle. But we can abstract each element for study. Thus Christ's passage through the heavens (iv. 14) or entry through the veil (vi. 20) recalls the high-priest's mysterious exits and entrances on the Day of Atonement, though indeed Jesus enters not to return (x. 12) save at the Last Day (ix. 28). Our access to the Father is mediated, like that of the Jews, by Priest and Victim (x. 10-21); our Victim, like theirs, suffered death "outside the camp" (xiii. 11, 12). Finally, the purpose of Christ's Sacrifice was to purify or make purification. That purpose was common both to the sacrifice of the Red Heifer and to the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement; and it had its analogue in the cleansing made by Christ.

Two objects are spoken of as cleansed by Christ's blood. We will take the most difficult first. The Day of Atonement witnessed the sprinkling of blood upon and before the mercy-seat, around the Holy Place, and upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering; and Hebrews finds prefigured here the cleansing of "the heavenly things themselves" (ix. 23). How shall we interpret these "heavenly things"? The answer seems to be that they are that whole supernatural order or network of realities and relationships which has been dislocated by sin. The need of it finds utterance in St. Paul's summons to the warfare "against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual host of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. vi. 12, R.V.). But, if sin is of such range, so likewise is redemption. To those same "principalities and powers" is now made known through the Church, exalted to sit with Jesus (Eph. ii. 6), the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 10). Christ cleansing the heavenly things is Christ "preparing a place" for believers in His Father's house (John xiv. 2).

More commonly, however, in the New Testament it is believers who are cleansed.* The classical passage is the sentence from which this study of the Atonement took its departure. "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" (Heb.

* Tit. ii. 14; Eph. v. 26; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 9; 1 John i. 7, 9; Heb. i. 3, ix. 14, x. 2, 22.

ix. 14). The effect of Christ's Sacrifice is, in short, the purgation or cleansing of the conscience. It is contrasted with the Levitical sacrifices in that, in their case, the purgation was ineffective: men were still conscious of sin, and found in them no inward harmony or peace with God. The process is throughout spiritual and ethical rather than forensic. The "blood" of Christ is the sign-manual of a will wholly and sinlessly surrendered to God (Heb. ix. 14, x. 10). It is ethical on man's side, further, in that it is dependent upon our faith,* fellowship, and contrition (1 Pet. i. 22; 1 John i. 7, 9). Its fruit is the hallowing of a peculiar people, "zealous of good works" (Tit. ii. 14). And it needs our conscious attention; it may not be "forgotten" (2 Pet. i. 9). But throughout the New Testament the instrument of this purification is the Lord's consummated Sacrifice and that alone. Can we define more clearly the manner of its operation, and so relate more closely its two terms—Christ's Sacrifice and man's soul?

In a celebrated passage of the *Poetics* Aristotle speaks of Tragedy fulfilling an ethical function which has so many points of contact with the one before us that we may well turn to it for light upon our problem:

> Tragedy, he says, is an imitation of an action that is serious, complete, and of a certain magnitude; in language embellished with each kind of artistic ornament, the several kinds being found in separate parts of the play; in the form of action, not of narrative; through pity and fear effecting the proper *Katharsis*, or purgation, of these emotions (*Poet.* vi. 2).†

There seems no doubt that the metaphor contained in this last phrase is medical, whereas that in Hebrews is ceremonial: *Katharsis* is not simply *Katharismos*. At the same time, when both metaphors are used to describe a psychological or pathological process and also contain in themselves the same fundamental idea of cleansing, it is obvious that the connection between them can be pressed. *Katharismos*, in short, when it becomes ethical, must at least involve a moral *Katharsis*.‡ In the ancient medical writers this latter term "denotes the removal of a painful or disturbing element from the organism,

* The late Dr. Whyte of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, once startled a congregation by beginning a sermon on the text, "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin," with the words: "There's no such text as this in the Bible—if yo take it alone." (*Cf. Life of Alexander Whyte*, p. 165.)

† In commenting on this passage I have followed the masterly treatment in Chapter VI. of Butcher's *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*.

‡ Butcher notes that καθαίρειν admits of a double construction: (*a*) with accusative of the thing purged away and removed; (*b*) with accusative of the thing cleansed. So we find καθαρισμός, καθαρίζω used (*a*) of the disease (Matt. viii. 3) or sins (Heb. i. 3: Westcott *in loc.*) removed (*cf.* the similar use of ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας in Heb. ii. 17) as well as (*b*) of the thing thus cleansed (*e.g.*, Heb. ix. 14).

and hence the purifying of what remains, by the elimination of alien matter."* By Tragedy Aristotle says that the twin emotions of pity and fear are purged, each of them containing a painful or morbid element which in the excitation of the emotions themselves is discharged. If we ask what this morbid element is which is thus purged away, the answer would seem to be that it is the self-regarding element found in pity as well as in fear. In real life fear is as a rule, pity often, mainly self-regarding: but in the theatre the appeal is to the universal in these emotions: their excitation has no reference to the petty interests of self: they are disengaged from the individual, and centred, by the onrush of active sympathy, in the tragic hero as the representative of man; and so universalized, they are cleansed.

I venture to urge that we have here an illuminating analogy with the cleansing power of the Cross. True, the *mise-en-scène* is grander and more profound. The universal is present, not by abstraction from real life, but because the central Figure is in reality Divine. What is purged, moreover, is not the particular emotions with which Aristotle was concerned, but the whole complex system of the moral consciousness. But none the less the parallel remains. He whose sufferings and death are the stimulus of our conscience is, like Aristotle's tragic hero, "like unto us" (*Poet.* xiii. 2; Heb. ii. 17, iv. 15), though with the difference that He is without sin. Our moral consciousness, like the emotions of pity and fear, contains a morbid element, in that it is largely self-regarding and that its natural reaction to sin is remorse.† Left to itself, it issues in "dead works"; but the presentation of Christ's Death as a satisfaction for sin expands it to comprehend the universal issues of Good and Evil, and in this enlargement it is cleansed. At the same time, those sufferings are peculiarly such as to arouse the whole of man's sympathy, for they are not only inflicted but sought, a sacrifice as well as a satisfaction, the very embodiment of Love. "God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. v. 8). And in the awakening of love for God lies the soul's purification.‡

The Church has a name for this purgative effect of the Passion on the conscience: it calls it Contrition. It is not the whole of repentance, just as purification does not exhaust the significance of Christ's Sacrifice. But it is the first step. And it is essentially an emotional purgation. It is rightly likened to the "dew," for in it the heart's dry surface is moistened.

* Butcher, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

† *Cf.* Macdougall, *Social Psychology*, pp. 440, 158.

‡ It may be observed that the purification of the people at the sight of one suffering innocently on their behalf is precisely so represented in Isaiah liii.

The combative elements in the will, so prominent in remorse, are turned into submission, and the soul becomes charged with a peculiar sweetness. The love of Christ, satisfying the righteousness of God on our behalf, awakens in him who becomes aware of it an answering love, which induces sorrow for sin and the desire to amend. The moral consciousness, in its apprehension of the past, is purified.

In the economy of Redemption, the great instrument through which this purification through the Cross is effected is the preaching and teaching of the Church. "Faith comes by hearing; and hearing through the word of Christ" (Rom. x. 17). So St. Paul: and St. Peter likewise addresses his readers as those who have sanctified their souls "in obeying the truth [through the Spirit]" (1 Pet. i. 22). We make a great mistake if we suppose that the application of Christ's sacrifice is only sacramental. In the order of spiritual consciousness preaching and teaching must come first. In the Church's youth they always preceded Baptism; and even to-day, when infant baptism is the rule, the sacrament is administered only in response to the sponsor's confession of faith. To minimize that fact is to reduce Baptism to something very like magic. Likewise it is a true instinct (however it may be sometimes abused) which has led the Church to associate Confirmation with confession and absolution; for the individual's conscious appropriation of the benefits of Baptism will issue first in contrition, and God's answer to contrition is pardon. But the foundation of the whole worshipful life which the Church nourishes lies in the presentation to the growing moral consciousness of the child or learner of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross as the perfect expression of God's purifying and pardoning love: for in proportion as this kindles the spiritual imagination, the conscience is purged of its legality and self-centredness, and the moral character enters into its inheritance of spiritual freedom.

II.—The Covenant.

No idea of sacrifice is more prominent in the passage of Hebrews from which we took our departure (ix. 14 ff.) than that of the Covenant. The life of fellowship with God or the worshipful life is made possible, because our consciences, giving us our sense both of the ultimate justice of things and of our own discord with it, have been cleansed by the blood of Christ who offered Himself as the spotless victim. That is why Jesus mediates a new Covenant, a new and established relation between God and man. His Death has made atonement or satisfaction for sin and so "sets man free: the Covenant gave him

the support he required. The Death removed the burden of the past: the Covenant provided for the service of the future."* Moreover, covenants themselves required sacrifice, with the death of a victim. That was the belief under the Old Dispensation (*cf.* Ps. l. 5); and the writer to the Hebrews expressly endorses it (ix. 17). So, too, the First Epistle of St. Peter opens with an allusion to the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (i. 2), recalling the sprinkling of the people at the making of the Covenant on Sinai. And the thought receives the authority even of Jesus Himself when He says at the Last Supper: "This is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many" (Mk. xiv. 24). Westcott is thus summarizing the New Testament teaching when he writes: "The system, the dispensation, established by Christ corresponds in the truest sense to a New Covenant, and rests upon a Covenant. A Covenant indeed requires for absolute validity the ratification by death, as is conspicuously illustrated by the fundamental covenant sacrifice in Genesis xv. and by the Covenant with Israel."†

The two sacrifices here alluded to provide two of the most awe-inspiring scenes in Old Testament story; but we must content ourselves here with considering their *rationale*. The clue is to be sought in the first of them, which has been the subject of much discussion. The main features of the sacrifice are the cutting in two of the animal victims, and the passage of the covenanting parties between the pieces so cut.‡ One view of this ritual is that it is a form of *sanctio*, the parties invoking upon themselves the fate of the victim if they should break their bond.§ Robertson Smith, on the one hand, maintained that the idea was purificatory and sacramental, the parties being regarded as united by common relation to the same victim's blood. The two views are discussed, illustrated, and reconciled by Sir James Frazer.‖ After showing how the idea of sanction is borne out by parallel customs on the Niger River, among the Chins of Burmah, and in ancient Assyria and Greece, he agrees that there are features in the Hebraic rite which are not accounted for on this view; and he proceeds to urge that modern Arab analogies tell rather in favour of the sacramental explanation, though he would speak of its purpose as protective rather than purificatory. Where peace is made, for instance, between

* Westcott on Heb. ix. 15.

† *Op. cit.*, Additional Note on Heb. ix. 16, § 10. The Mosaic Covenant-sacrifice is described in Exod. xxiv. 3-8.

‡ In Gen. xv. 17 the Divine Presence is represented by "a smoking furnace and a flaming torch" (*cf.* Exod. iii. [the burning bush]).

§ So Driver on Jer. xxxiv. 18.

‖ *Folklore in the Old Testament*, Part II., chap. i.

enemies, "the invaders purify or protect themselves from the malign influence of their foes by implicitly entering into a blood covenant with them."* But Sir James is unwilling to regard the two views as finally exclusive of one another, and he concludes by urging that "the rite is composed of two distinct but correlated elements—namely, first the cutting of the victim in two, and second, the passing of the covenanters between the pieces. Of these two elements the first is to be explained by the retributive, and the second by the sacramental theory. The two theories are complementary to each other, and together furnish a complete explanation of the rite."

This analysis is important, because it throws light forward on to the more conventional type of Covenant-sacrifice in which the children of Israel took part after the giving of the Law (Exod. xxiv. 3-8). The bisection of the victims has become the "burnt-offerings" and "peace-offerings of oxen," though the mention of "half" the blood being sprinkled on the altar and half on the people may be an echo of the earlier rite. But the sprinkling itself is sacramental and symbolic of consecration rather than of cleansing.† "The primary purpose of the sprinkling was to consecrate the covenant between Jehovah and the people, the invisible bond between them being indicated by the community of origin of the blood on the altar, as representing Jehovah, and the blood on the persons of the people."‡ Its idea, that is to say, is positive and forward-looking rather than retrospective or expiatory.

In what sense does this type of sacrifice find its fulfilment in the blood of Christ? Or, more simply, in what way does Jesus, through His Death, mediate a new Covenant? I say more simply, because it is consideration of the character of the Covenant mediated which will set us on the road to an answer.

By the Christian Covenant we mean that positive and settled relationship between God and man which stands in God's grace and man's faith and is the ground of the life of worship. Satisfaction, purification, forgiveness—these are part of the Covenant, as an introduction may be part of a book; and in the order of the spiritual life they are indispensable; but they are not its substantive part. That substantive part is the security of salvation or eternal life, which God made to man in the Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of His Son, and in the consequent outpouring of the Spirit, and which the energy of the same Spirit and the Church's response of faith and love still maintain.

* *Folklore in the Old Testament*, p. 168.

† Consecration involves cleansing in a broad sense. The point is that the sprinkling of the people is not a kind of washing: the emphasis is on the positive relationship established. Hebrews passes in a flash to the direct idea of cleansing in ix. 21.

‡ Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, note on i. 2.

Christ's blood is "the blood of the new covenant," because His Death was, and is, the crucial and central act on which its blessings are secured. We could not of ourselves open a way into the life of salvation and the service of the living God; for only a total and complete surrender to the Spirit could do that. That is why Hebrews reminds us that Jesus offered Himself "though eternal Spirit" to God. His self-oblation was no merely individual act: it was the act of One who was always Man's representative, and whose Life was for ever and unintermittently surrendered to the grace of God.

Further, such interaction of God and Man in the historic Person and acts of Jesus Christ could not be achieved without death. A Covenant-sacrifice always involves the surrender of the lower values for the sake of the higher. The parties set aside their personal and transient interests and desires for an end that enlists the will in some more abiding and less individual purpose; and their relation to the common purpose is ratified and symbolized in their treatment of the sacrificial victim. But in the case of Jesus, mediating the new covenant of the supernatural life, the lower values to be surrendered ranged out to include the whole limitations of purely human life—its successiveness, its cage of time and space, its independence. Death alone could set free His Spirit into universal power. "I have a baptism to be baptized with: and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!"—that is the obverse of the experience which underlies His apocalyptic visions of Judgment and Sovereignty. And such conflict finds solution only through Death. Through Death He was glorified, because through death He passed to the Risen and Ascended Life and became "life-giving Spirit."* Till then, "the Spirit was not yet"; and the spiritual covenant foreshadowed by the prophets was not established except through Calvary.

This interpretation of Our Lord's Death as the supreme Covenant-sacrifice, whereby believers stand in the spiritual and worshipful life which Jesus has opened for them, seems to find endorsement in the celebrated passage in Romans vi., where St. Paul speaks of Baptism. Two kinds of symbolism are used in the New Testament in connection with Baptism. In the one case the stress is laid on the symbolic *object*—water—and the idea is that of washing or cleansing (*e.g.*, Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5). In the other the stress is laid on the symbolic *action*—dipping or immersion. This is the more common, and is the symbolism employed in Romans vi. In the action of Baptism the Christian recapitulates in his own personal

* *Cf.* Heb. xii. 24, "the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

experience Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection. The Cross terminated for Jesus the power of sin and death, because in it He was emancipated from the conditions of successiveness where sin and death hold sway; and He rose again to live "in uninterrupted communion with God."* Baptism is the symbolic action by which believers are made to participate in the new life and standing with God, thus won for them by man's Representative. Hebrews says (ix. 16) that "where there is a covenant, a death of him that made it must needs be presented." A covenant implies—that is to say, on the part of the covenanter—the decisive cessation of all such relationships as are inconsistent with the bond; and in the case of the Covenant of eternal life, this will mean the actual death of Him who mediates: He will be Victim as well as Agent of the Covenant. In Romans vi. St. Paul does not use the language of covenanting, and his thought is perhaps freer in consequence. But the underlying idea is substantially the same; and St. Paul is but applying it to the moral life, when he exhorts his readers to reckon themselves "dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus" (vi. 11).

On God's side the Covenant needs, and admits of, no renewal (Rom. ix. 9; Heb. ix. 26); but on man's side, where successiveness still rules, it does. And so, before He made His one oblation, Jesus provided the means whereby the Covenanter's death might be continually "presented" or "brought forward." "This cup," He said, "is the new covenant in my blood." "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup," says St. Paul, "ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come." No one who has entered into the meaning of the Eucharist can fail to see how it develops, transfigures, and satisfies all the dim gropings of instinct expressed in the Covenant-sacrifice of Abraham. The purpose of the Covenant is changed from the promise of a multitudinous progeny in future ages to the realization of a life with God here and now "in the heavenly places": the human Covenanter is not the "father of many nations," but the God-Man, representing all mankind of every age and clime: and the victim has become that same God-Man, whose accepted Sacrifice we plead before the Father. But still between the "broken pieces"—the Body broken and the Blood outpoured—the eye of faith perceives the passing of "a smoking furnace and a lamp of fire" (Gen. xv. 17); the awful Majesty, the consuming and illuminating Love, that betoken the Presence of God.

E. G. Selwyn.

* Sanday and Headlam, *in loc.*

THE VALUE OF THE ENGLISH TRADITION

Father Knox, in his book on *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England*,* clearly expects it to grow more Roman in character and practice. He guards his prophecy—"historical analogy suggests the victory of those now regarded as extremists; but historical analogy is an unsafe guide to the future . . ." "the main body of Catholic opinion at the present moment undoubtedly favours a certain measure of adherence to the Anglican tradition in such matters as the retention of the use of English as the language of liturgical worship, the giving of Communion in both kinds, and certain minor matters." But he doubts whether this will endure, and believes that it will not. "It seems certain that the progress of Catholicism in the English Church will sooner or later involve an unmarried priesthood. . . ." "Without excluding the more old-fashioned type of Anglican piety," the movement "has made room for the development of other types more suited to the needs of an age which is largely dominated by a love of variety and sensation. Thus English devotion is appropriating more and more the forms of piety by means of which the Catholic reformers of the Continent drove back the advancing tide of Protestantism at the Reformation, particularly the conscious love of Jesus, frequently received in Holy Communion, and ever-present in the Tabernacle, the joy of the constant fellowship and succour of Mary the Mother of God, and the great army of the Saints of the Holy Catholic Church."

There were perhaps other methods, less fair and less Catholic, by which this last process was aided; but we have no desire to criticize Fr. Knox in detail. Both friends and foes may be grateful for the book. It is an able, vivid, and temperate, albeit uncompromising, statement of English Catholicism. Its historical sketches are as sound and fair as such broad generalizations can be. Its appreciation of the Evangelical and Liberal Protestant contributions to English religion will surprise those who regard Catholics as blind to any other virtues or truths than their own. Englishmen have now before them an absolutely candid exposition of the beliefs and hopes of the "Catholic party" from its most "extreme" angle. But in so far as the author underlines the impression mistakenly gathered by the public from the second Anglo-Catholic Congress, that all English Catholics are Latin in sympathy, it is well to

* *The Catholic Movement in the Church of England*, W. L. Knox. London: P. Allan and Co. 8s. 6d.

say plainly that this is not the case; and that while the two sections do not think it worth while to quarrel over details and future tendencies, the "main body" which "favours a certain measure of adherence to the Anglican tradition" attaches a value to English ideals of Catholicism which is underestimated and perhaps misunderstood.

This value is, we maintain, a positive thing. It is no mere plea for pause in a lightning advance, but for advance in a surer direction of victory. There is a dread of an English insularity and singularity incompatible with the name Catholic, which rightly leads English Catholics to look to and learn from Rome; that Fr. Knox adequately emphasizes. But insularity is not the only peril which dogs our race. The English people has historically again and again in the best and highest activities of mind and soul acted in anything but an insular way, and stifled its own genius. It has allowed Germans and Italians to crush out for decades its musical soul; France its artistic; to foreign philosophies, theologies, science, it has continually paid ludicrous deference; if its self-content is always strong, its self-contempt is often even more convinced and more popular. The one danger is to be watched as much as the other, not least in matters of religion, where neither the obvious nor the logical serves as a measure of truth. We ought not to compare the richest side of Rome with the poorest of Canterbury, nor *vice versa*, yet we do it daily. Their respective ways of behaving in Church provide a parable. We go abroad, and wax enthusiastic over the homely, familiar way in which other peoples use their churches. They visit us, and are abased by the solemn reverence which we dub "stiff." English Catholicism must remain English to give special and large contributions to Catholicism as a whole: after all, if it has been led at all by the Holy Spirit, that is the most natural manner in which to construe the meaning of its remarkable history. Let us consider, then, without shame the special values of the English tradition of Catholicism.

I.

And first with regard to the question—which looms unduly large, perhaps, in Fr. Knox's presentation—of *forms of worship*. All Catholics feel that the present Eucharistic Liturgy is no longer adequate. The frank desire of the "extreme wing" is to bring it as close as possible to the Gregorian: for the sake not only of eventual reunion, but of present spiritual unity in the power of a living and widespread rite. The desire of the "main body" is different—to win for the Church of England

and her daughters, while building on foundations now old and tried and loved, the fullest and finest Liturgy in Catholic Christendom: and thus, not only to enrich beyond measure the present sacramental worship of the Anglican Communion, but also to prepare a contribution, made possible not less by our freedom and sense of modern need than by liturgical scholarship, to the devotional wealth of the reunited Church of the future. Anglican freedom has in this sphere as in others its special responsibility, not merely to preserve its existing office, however sufficient and beloved; nor merely to imitate another, however living and august; but, while taking full account of both, to build up as noble a Liturgy as possible. The process of liturgical development begun and ever continuing in the prayer-books of daughter Churches—Scotland, America, South Africa, and others—has come to a critical stage with the decision of the mother to move. The present revision will affect not only the parish churches of England, but the English-speaking world. So large a break of continuity and tradition as a Mass not founded upon the present Prayer Book is simply impossible. Nor does the main body of Catholics in the least desire it: it desires, not the most Latin, but the fullest and richest English Mass possible.

Fr. Knox develops an extraordinary argument for the Latin rite, that "the whole tendency of modern life is against the production of a type of mind which can express itself in a steady, sober, and regular devotion": and that types of modern Roman devotion "are more suited to an age which is largely dominated by a love of variety and sensationalism." It does not seem a healthy recommendation. Nor from either side is it true. Our Prayer Book rite, if here and there inadequate in content and arrangement, is not *dull*. I do not see how any Eucharistic Liturgy can be dull, except in so far as constant use makes anything in a sense dull, and *per contra* as novelty makes anything exciting. And it is an insult to the Roman Mass, Father Knox speaks as though its use made for constant excitement, the more so, apparently, if said in Latin! And if his comparison covers more than Mass, it is equally rash; and quite the weakest argument for "an unauthorized movement" that has ever been heard. The fact is, the "Western use" has grown up for other reasons, first from the just reverence and admiration felt towards a Communion which has lived for centuries with much for which we are struggling; and secondly from the fact that, as it stands, the Prayer Book rite is reserved or deficient in the expression of important elements in Catholic Eucharistic doctrine and devotion.

Now the first of these reasons loses its force daily as the

English Church becomes more confident of its Catholicity and interprets its formularies and handles its ceremonial more freely and boldly in that sense; the second will doubtless be thoroughly dealt with in this revision or the next. And it was along these lines on the whole that the Green Book acted, and though one or two minor details seemed to introduce Latinisms for Latinism's sake, its main attempt was to produce a better Liturgy; not for one moment did it try to satisfy any contemporary demand for excitement. Perhaps its framers had been wiser to do so, for its Grey rival drew its strength from its novelty. Good details can often emerge from an unsatisfactory whole, and there are details in the Grey Book worthy of serious study; but its effort to introduce an Eastern element into the Canon seems to us purely academic, based on no real demand, and opposed to the wishes both of the Evangelical and Catholic elements in the Church.

What has become clear is that the present Liturgy is bound to be the substructure of the whole; and that whatever may be introduced from other sources will be for its enrichment along the lines of true Catholic development, not for its supersession or transformation into something else. Fr. Knox pleads for the Latin tongue, on the grounds of the virtue and value of hieratic language in the Holy Mysteries. But the English of the Prayer Book has exactly that value, with the gain that it does not sacrifice intelligence. It is a language majestic and unapproachable to-day, the national language at once of its birth and fine flower, contemporary—more or less—with the great Tudor writers, senior even to the Bible, and with it the norm and inspiration of English literature since, bringing at every turn nobility and discipline into the common speech. It is incredible that English Catholics should ever think of displacing it. To do so would almost be sacramental of denationalizing Catholicism. We do not wish again to run that dreadful risk.

Yet while the English Liturgy in itself is not dull, its rendering can be very drab. That, however, is not the fault of the Liturgy but of the renderers. The Catholic revival has already shown the way to mend that. Indeed, it has not yet completed its experiments. If an exact following of Roman ceremonial, or an exact revival of Sarum be all that is required to satisfy the sensationalism of the age, let us do either or both. Time, experience, the revised Liturgy, and popular approval will finally decide a customary ritual. Our own opinion for what it is worth is that, for the sake both of Catholic evangelization and of fostering devotion, we should mingle warmth and simplicity; and employ, far more than we do, the " Folk-Mass " with hymns. It combines the English love

of hymns and of simplicity (neither of which is un-Catholic and both inexpugnable) with the atmosphere, at once homely and dignified, of Catholic externals. Incidentally, it is the advice that Dr. Adrian Fortescue gives to his own Communion in England. The shorter time it takes, the small numbers of the clergy in an average parish, are practical advantages. But it seems best to answer the question, "What rendering of Mass will the English people learn most quickly and easily to *love?*" and that is the thing which matters.

To sum up so far. We do not believe that the main body of English Catholics dislikes the Prayer Book, or wishes to disparage or revolutionize it. They do badly desire its enrichment and the correction of deficiencies, so that Catholic truth is fully expressed, and Catholic devotion have fair and free play. They do not want the Roman Mass *per se;* but, proceeding along the age-long Catholic tradition of liturgical development, seek the best Mass possible. They do not want the Latin language, for that would compromise their influence on English-speaking Christianity; and the language of the Prayer Book is in itself a noble possession, and a very lovely Catholic vestment, though it be of "the English use."

II.

Turn, then, to fields no less important than that of public worship, where English Catholicism, if it is not to commit suicide and to fail in its duty to the Catholic Church, must emphasize and develop its own tradition. Notice that these are not merely national traditions which may be properly held in a local Church, but Catholic traditions and characteristics, which, owing to the independence of the Church of England, have historically been preserved in it, and which elsewhere in the Church, East and West, find at best a limited and hampered expression. They happen also to be of paramount and increasing moment in the witness of the Catholic Church of this age.

The first of these fields is that of intellectual sincerity and exploration. People as a whole have hardly yet recognized that the arrival in force of modern criticism and modern science since 1860 (to give a rough date) has brought difficulties and wrought changes in Christianity *which are vaster and more fundamental than those of the Reformation.* The Reformation never questioned the Greek definitions of the Person of Christ. It was even obscurantist and benighted on the doctrine of Inspiration. It made dismal mistakes about the nature of God. Considering the innumerable instruments of critical

apparatus, and the gigantic worlds of new knowledge, stimulating, fascinating, engrossing, and departmentalizing the mind of the age, the outburst of infidelity and the middle ways of a hundred modernisms cease to astonish us. The old naturally suffers eclipse in the intoxication of so great a birthday. Those who measure the magnitude of suns, and reveal the parts and passions of electrons, those who trace back the story of man and beast through awful aeons, and carry the human voice in an instant over oceans, have neither time nor inclination to pause and adjust their idea of God to what, after all, is His own new revelation. As the world thus grows larger and smaller and more infinitely complex, the love and greatness of its Maker in choosing to be Incarnate becomes more staggering. The conflict of the modern "reformation" is not about the worship and government of the Church, but about God Himself. A host of new theories and philosophies arise to explain the universe, all having this in common, that they prove inadequate to the needs of any but their formulators of the first generation; and having at best emphasized a partial truth, die. Such a state of affairs throws a burden altogether unique in Christian history on Christian thought. Nothing can survive or prevail, the *truth* of which is incapable of sound defence. Even the Church must fail if she is unable to show that her doctrines enfold and illuminate all the new knowledge better than the systems, and make the larger vision of God available for the inspiration and practical life of men. And at the moment, of the historic Communions, only the Anglican is free to undertake this first of all Christian tasks. The Eastern Church dwells out of the modern intellectual world, facing infidel foes of another sort. The Western meets the attack mainly by its discipline and steady witness of prayer. Where its voice had been more needed than ever in history, it has scarcely spoken except to assert the infallibility which remains dumb. If the utterances upon Old Testament authorship or against Modernism are to be regarded as the contributions of that unique authority to our problems, they do not count. But after the first shock of surprise, the Anglican thinkers and scholars have done their best, working hard, shirking no sound conclusion of criticism, but showing how actually it helps; trembling before no discovery of science, but interpreting with joy a new gift from the Father of Love and the Eternal Wisdom.

The Catholic revival here, and Catholic truth everywhere, owe much to the superb labours of such men as Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, and their younger Oxford contemporaries of the Lux Mundi school. The succession continues both within and without the Universities. It is a pity indeed that the

Church does not more emphatically encourage and honour sacred study, pure and applied: and that pastoral zeal too often hurries the ordained of brilliant mind to a parish, when the unfettered use of his mind would be the more valuable gift to the Church. Nevertheless, the intellectual sincerity of the Church of England stands high, despite the headiness —and ignorance—of some Modernist theologians who consign to intellectual limbo all divines but themselves. As a matter of fact, the weight of Anglican scholarship is orthodox and Catholic; and English Catholics must be careful not to make the mistake of estimating the Catholicity of Anglican doctors by the garments which they wear in church; and not by the only true criterion—by what they write and teach.

The warning is needed, because there is real danger that English Catholics—to draw a rough distinction—of the parishes and of the universities will misunderstand one another. The energies of the latter are inevitably at such a time as this absorbed in the defence and interpretation of the essential and central things, the Incarnation of God the Son, the Person of Jesus Christ. Until the attacks on these are countered, and the reasonableness of the Catholic religion reasserted with power, it is not to be expected that the theologians can devote their energies to less central matters.

English Catholics, therefore, eagerly desire the continuance and development of the Anglican tradition of a scholarship, free to express itself as it wishes, not primarily seeking to justify what exists, but fearlessly pressing forward in a thinking world to reinterpret old truth and unveil new. Such an ideal is faithful to truth, and fulfils a duty to the Catholic Church as a whole which no other of its branches can under conditions so favourable. It accepts the perils of this "Liberal Catholicism"; it recognizes that here and there extremists ("Modernists") will necessarily be thrown up; and even that they may perform a legitimate pastorate among a large class of doubters in an age of transition. But neither new philosophies nor new theologies any longer cause it fear. The wrecks of hundreds are strewn along the last few decades, and any partial truths they helped to emphasize have been gathered up, and enrich the orthodox treasuries. Research has been proved only to reveal, and invention only to unfold, the glory of God. Fr. Knox, in his sympathetic estimate of the Liberals of the 'Sixties implicitly admits this peculiar vocation of Anglo-Catholicism, but in his preoccupation with questions of cult does not emphasize its paramount importance.

III.

He does not, however, overlook another distinctive feature of English Catholicism—its social passion. He shares it himself: "There is no excuse for a system which condemns a large proportion of the nation to the atrocious conditions in which the poorest classes of English society are compelled to live at present." Quite rightly he shows that with the advent of democracy, trade unionism, etc., the chance of the parish priest to be a political reformer has passed away, and his business is to preach the Gospel to the poor. But though this be so, the passion of social pity and effort has not passed and will not pass away. It is of course shared by Evangelists and Nonconformists. That only underlines the fact that here again we have something typically British to contribute to Catholicism as a whole, where this passion of reform has been woefully to seek. Saints like Frederick Denison Maurice and Henry Scott Holland are peculiar to the Church of England, uniting the tenderest mysticism with high scholarship and vast achievement in the improvement of social conditions. They and their disciples have given greatly to the Catholic Church.

IV.

That marked characteristic of the Englishman, his illogical common-sense, has also influenced English Catholicism, and will undoubtedly continue to be one of its distinguishing marks. Now it is very easy, especially in matters of faith, to make mistakes by following common-sense, however native. The instinct, even of the deeply religious man, is not necessarily either holy or true. But as Fr. Knox is careful to point out, not every protest of the Reformation was un-Catholic; and we may be quite certain, whether we like it or not, that English Catholicism will never as a whole exchange its traditions for Roman ones on two points where he hopes that it will: first, as regards the marriage of clergy; and secondly, as regards receiving Communion in both kinds.

Historically, England was not alone in demanding these two things at the Reformation. At the Council of Trent, Catholic Europe north of the Alps unanimously asked for both. Able papal diplomacy and the organized majority of Italian Bishops staved off rather than refused them. In the light of Church History, East and West, it is impossible to call either practice un-Catholic. With regard to Communion, it is simply unthinkable that the laity would acquiesce for any reason in

the withdrawal of the Cup; however specious the arguments put forward, they would make unanswerable retort with the Gospel. It seems indeed a pity ever to do more than recommend partaking in one kind in cases of emergency, such as war and sickness.

Nor has the mass of English Catholicism much feeling against the marriage of clergy, except of course in the case of Religious. A certain number, it is true, both of priests and laymen, do feel strongly on the side of celibacy; on the other hand, it is surprising how many of the latter, convinced Catholics, especially in the country, prefer their priests to be married. The theoretical disadvantages of the married priest are easy to see; and nobody can doubt that, from the point of view of the Church's efficiency, the proportion of married clergy is too great. But in practice, the number of married Catholic priests is large; and who is going to maintain that normally their energy, influence, single-mindedness, or pastoral zeal has declined, or that their ministry (which adds the influence of a home to that of a man) is of less blessing than the celibates'?

On neither of these points, however strongly individuals may feel, are we able to detect any serious pressure for change among the main body of English Catholics, nor any consciousness that the fulness of our Catholicity is impaired by them. Nor do they constitute any bar to reunion by the witness of Rome itself.

V.

The truth is, that the English genius can be wedded to Catholicism as easily and richly as the Latin; and it is a great advantage, that it should be able to do so independently. The dangers of this independence happily exist no longer. It has often escaped notice, how many barriers to greater unity, and risks of religious insularity have been destroyed simply by the revolutions in the means of communication. The world is now almost as small as Great Britain a century ago. And so the Christian communions have begun a process of learning and borrowing from one another, of which the growing desire for reunion is only one, and not the profoundest result. We have recovered and restated our Catholicity with the pre-eminent, if unwilling, help of Rome. We repay our debt, partly by return gifts to Rome—especially in the intellectual defence of the Catholic Faith—to a larger extent in making Catholic doctrine and practice more available to the Nonconformist population amongst us; but most of all in presenting to the modern democratic and critical world, a Catholicism

which has faced both the Reformation of the 1500's without losing its Apostolicity nor yet refusing what was in many directions a just criticism; and also that of the 1800's, with a conviction which stands and grows, free and fearless, amid all the changed categories and manifold novelties of thought.

English Catholicism thus has a work of its own to do for the whole Church, which can only be done in its own conditions of freedom, and which in large degree depends for its influence on maintaining its Englishry—those not un-Catholic traditions of character, common-sense, candour, and cult which make it understanded by the British peoples, and trusted even where it is opposed. While it will always be buttressed on one side by the mighty Roman witness to supernatural religion, it has, we believe, come almost to an end of its deliberate borrowings in the devotional and cultural provinces, and needs to sit down quietly to digest them. The points for which the extreme wing is now fighting are not of the substance or the doctrinal certainty of those which the last generations have won for us: and the inevitable result of exaggerating by controversy these fringe-tenets, is a considerable stumbling-block in the way of those who are now ready to accept the central. At the moment there is a marked tendency among the younger men at the old Universities to identify Anglo-Catholicism with its more spectacular Latinisms; and while full of Catholic fervour, going regularly to Confession and daily Mass, to avoid the title Anglo-Catholic, and to call themselves Liberal Evangelicals or Toc H! They would, in fact, accept roughly Fr. Knox's presentation of the Catholic Faith, and refuse his judgment and hopes as to future prospects. And though the opinions of such young men are not to be accepted as the criteria of the Catholic revival, I believe they speak for more than themselves, for the main body of English Catholicism, which has now lost its sense of insecurity, and feels that the greatest danger to complete victory is that Rupert's cavalry are dashing too far ahead.

E. Milner-White.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among this month's contributors, the Rev. E. Milner-White, D.S.O., is Fellow and Dean of King's College, Cambridge, and Superior of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, which now has "Colleges" in Kent and in Rhodesia, and contemplates the formation of another as a Bush Brotherhood in the diocese of Rockhampton.

Recent theological quarterlies have contained some important articles.

The *Anglican Theological Review* (U.S.A.) for October, 1923, includes a beautiful study by Professor G. A. Cooke of "The Unknown Martyr" of Zech. xi. and xii.—a figure parallel to that of Isa. liii. In the *Journal of Theological Studies* of the same date, Dr. H. J. Rose contributes a masterly and detailed examination of the prose rhythms in the Pauline Epistles, and on the basis of it distinguishes between them as follows as regards authorship:

Genuine : Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal., 1 Thess., Philipp.
Probably Genuine : 2 Tim., Philem., "Phœbe," perhaps 2 Thess.
Spurious : Eph., 1 Tim.
Probably Spurious : Col., Tit.

The *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1923, and January, 1924, contains valuable articles on Marriage and various aspects of it, by Professor Felix Adler, the Rev. L. Hodgson, and Professor and Mrs. Lindsay. They afford welcome evidence of the way in which the best ethical thought of our time is tending to corroborate the Christian standard. Professor Adler's article, in particular (October, 1923), should be studied by all who have the ideals of Christian marriage at heart. In his January survey of recent theological work Dr. Moffatt draws attention to the Bishop of Zanzibar's article on the synoptic problem in last November's Theology.

We are indebted to Mr. Lowther Clarke for a list of urgent New Testament tasks suggested at a conference of New Testament scholars at Würzburg, and published in the *Zeitschrift für Neues Testament Wissenschaft* last year. They are:

1. The preparation of a cheap and accurate edition of the New Testament in which variant readings would so far as possible be classified under the headings of ancient recensions—*i.e.*, H(esychius), P(amphilus) L(ucian), W(estern Text). Gregory's signs for MSS. to be used exclusively.

2. The issue of a new critical text, on the basis of Tischendorf's *editio critica octava major*, which remains indispensable, in spite of von Soden-Tischendorf's apparatus, should be (*a*) freed from all inaccuracies and superfluities, (*b*) supplemented by modern knowledge, (*c*) arranged in a clearer way. The difficulties, however, are for the present insuperable, and all that can be done is to make a quiet beginning.

3. The production of a revised Wetstein, or thesaurus of passages illustrating the New Testament, is urgent now that the English workers have given up their scheme and handed over their material to Germany.

The members of the Conference parted with a feeling that great benefit was derived from such meeting with fellow-workers. Would not British theological scholarship (he adds) be benefited by a New Testament conference similar to that held by the Society for Old Testament study ?

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

FASTING AND ABSTINENCE

It is tacitly assumed by many English Churchmen that the distinction between these words is obvious. In preparing S.P.C.K. almanacks, I have not made any distinction between days of fasting and days of abstinence, and S.P.C.K. has been accordingly accused of ignorance.

It would be a help to the Literature Committee if readers of Theology could produce evidence showing what the Prayer Book means by " Days of Fasting, or Abstinence." I am inclined to think that it employs two words, one of Teutonic, the other of Latin origin, as frequently in " Dearly Beloved Brethren," to mean the same thing.

This view is supported by *The Catholic Encyclopædia* article " Abstinence," which presumably reflects Roman Catholic practice in U.S.A., where the Church is mainly English-speaking, but of other than English origin. Lent and Ember Days are said to be days of fasting and abstinence. The essence of abstinence is to take one meal in twenty-four hours. Local rules vary, and meat is allowed at times. An unlimited quantity of food at one meal does not break the fast, though you may sin against *temperance* thereby. " Abstinence " is treated in a long article as the general word. A short article on " Fasting " starts by declaring it to be a Teutonic word equivalent to the Latin " abstinentia."

Bishop A. J. Maclean, in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* article " Fasting," says that Roman Catholics make a distinction. " On a day of abstinence, meat is forbidden, but there is no restriction on the quantity of food taken; on a fast day the quantity also is restricted. The distinction as regards England is modern; in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer the two terms are used synonymously. The distinction was introduced among the English Roman Catholics in 1761, Fridays and Rogation Days being Days of Abstinence."

Is there any evidence, perhaps from sixteenth-century household accounts, that the Bishop is wrong? English Churchmen would pay great deference to the practice of the Latin Church in a matter of this kind (in the absence of guidance from the Lenten Pastorals of their own Bishops, where else can they look?), but has a local English Roman Catholic custom any claim to their allegiance?

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

[N.B.—The note published below is a study for Fr. Wagget's forthcoming Hulsean Lectures.]

St. Luke xvii. 20: *Οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως.*

The words as they come to us might mean either that the coming of the Kingdom will be so little public that it is not open to observation, or that it will be so little private that careful inquiry and investigation are not needed for its discovery. That is to say, they might mean either that the coming will be secret or that it will not be secret.

In the absence of guidance from the Greek, which was doubtless intended to represent accurately the original words,* it would be difficult to choose between these interpretations, although they are exactly opposed.

The choice would be guided by a reader's sense of the general bearing of the section. The section, as a whole, including the Pharisees' question (but I return to this later), seems to refer to the then future coming of the Kingdom in completed power; not to its then past arrival in the person of the King; nor to its gradual advent, by "spiritual," sacramental, and moral processes, in the minds and in the society of believers.

With one most important exception—For behold the Kingdom of God is among (or within) you—to be presently considered, all the sayings in the section, without interruption or contrast, seem to look forward and to look to an event. "When cometh the Kingdom?" "Neither shall they say (in the future), Behold, here or there." Days will come when the faithful will desire in vain to see one of the days of the Son of Man. A future condition is predicted. Certain people will then say, Behold here or behold there; and the faithful are forbidden to follow these directions; and this because the coming will be in the highest degree manifest. Then follows, as in Matt. xxiv. 27, the parallel of the lightning beginning in one quarter of the sky and flashing to the opposite quarter; and in both these Gospels (Matt. xxiv. 28 and Luke xvii. 37), the image of the eagles adds the teaching that the place of meeting cannot be missed by those concerned to be there.

With the great exception already mentioned, all the words point to a future and manifest event. (But see below on a possible division.)

Can we then in *οὐκ ἔρχεται . . . μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* find any confirmation of the view that "with observation" means "secretly," and "not with observation" means "not secretly"?

The word *παρατήρησις* is not found in the New Testament except in this place, nor in the LXX.† The verb *παρατηρέω* comes six times

* The Peshitta does not solve our question.

† It comes in Aq. of Exod. xii. 42, in place of *προφυλακή*, "(a night) to be much observed."

in the New Testament; four times in the Gospels, once in Acts, and once in Paul. In the last place (" Ye observe days," Gal. iv. 10) there is perhaps the sense of scrupulous or anxious observance, but more probably of observance simply.*

In the five earlier places παρατ. has always the sense of a careful, jealous, and (as it happens) hostile watching. The six passages are Mark iii. 2, Luke vi. 7, Luke xiv. 1 (they watched Him), Luke xx. 20 (they watched Him and sent spies), Acts ix. 24 (they watched the gates day and night to kill Paul), and Gal. iv. 10.

Except in Acts the Latin Vulgate has *observare* in all six places, and in our text *cum observatione.*

The first five passages suggest that Luke xvii. 20 means that the coming needs for its detection no exact questioning or anxious watch, as if would if it were likely to pass unnoticed. It will be like an illumination of the whole sky, like the quarry to which the birds, as if infallibly, assemble.

It is still possible to take the words by themselves to teach an imperceptible approach;† and Grinfield, in his *Scholia Hellenistica*, commenting on the place, says, *quid significat hoc in loco dici nequit e scriptoribus Graecis.*

But—and this is the occasion of my note—Father Puller has shown me a Greek Patristic writer who gives no uncertain guidance, not, indeed, directly about the text, but about the meaning of μετὰ παρατηρήσεως. For what a Patristic passage of uncertain date is worth, it is decisive for the sense " secret."

In the 97th of the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem* given among the *Spuria* of St. Athanasius are these words:‡ ἄλλο πάλιν κρῖμα τοῦ μετὰ παρατηρήσεως ἁμαρτάνοντος παρὰ τὸν ἀναισχύντως ἑαυτὸν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἐκδιδόντα.

Here sinning μετὰ παρατηρήσεως is favourably contrasted with sinning ἀναισχύντως ; and since the latter qualification means " with shameless disregard of appearances," the former must mean " secretly " or at least " with the precaution of a man who tries to escape detection." There would not be much to choose between a man who " abandons himself shamelessly to sin " and a man who transgresses " in such a manner that he can be watched with the eyes " (Thayer's Grimm).

That the words τὸν ἀναισχύντως κ.τ.λ. may not be supposed to refer only to the frequency or immoderate character of wrongdoing and not to its openness, it may be noted that another part of the same disagreeable *Quaestio* points the contrast between rare and habitual bad conduct. Even if we translate μετὰ π. " discreetly " or, with the Benedictine editor, *cum aliqua observatione*, we do not get much nearer to *cum praevio apparatu, cum pompa externa militum* (Cornelius à Lapide *in loc.*), or " with outward

* Josephus (*Antiquitates* 3, 5, 5, and 14, 10, 25, uses παρατηρέω of observing weeks and the Sabbath (τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν) in the sense (Thayer's Grimm) of " neglecting nothing requisite to the religious observance."

† Thayer's Grimm translates " in such a manner that it can be watched with the eyes—*i.e.*, in a visible manner "; and the negative οὐκ ἔρχ. would give us " the Kingdom cometh not visibly."

‡ *Opp. S. Athanasii*, Tom ii., p. 238. Benedictine edition. Patavii, 1777. With respect to the date of the passage, it is to be noted that the Quaestiones, once only 35 in number and later 41, grew to a collection of 136, *librariis novas quaestiones semper addentibus* (De Montfaucon in the edition quoted, p. 201). The date of the 97th therefore lies within wide limits. But whoever wrote it expected it to be understood, and in the absence of other instances of μετὰ π. his use of it is important.

show" (A.V. margin), or to making the sentence mean that the coming is inconspicuous.

This passage, then, decidedly encourages us to equate "not with observation" with "not in secret or obscurity"; and the reading of our text as meaning that the Kingdom comes not secretly or unobserved.

There is a coming that is unobserved of the world, and with this the answer to S. Jude's question is concerned (John xiv. 22). But the coming here spoken of will be known to all.

What, then, are we to say of the words that so soon follow, "For the Kingdom of God is among you"? Must not these words at least refer to an arrival already accomplished but undetected and unsuspected? Are they not parallel to *ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία* (Luke xi. 20, "the Kingdom . . . is come upon you")? And must they not govern the interpretation of *οὐκ ἔρχεται κ.τ.λ.*?

There is a way of escape from the conclusion suggested; but it is a way few will be ready to take. It is to read the words *ἰδοὺ . . . ἐντὸς* as part of the foretold utterance of those who will say, "Behold here," in fact, as following *οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν*. This would make the foretold false teaching run "Lo here, lo there; for the Kingdom of God is among you or in your society." It would be the utterance of men who, like the false teachers recorded by St. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 2), cry, "We are already in the day of the Lord, the Kingdom is among you unperceived, and we are in a position to disclose its whereabouts—in the desert, in the secret chambers" (Matt. xxiv. 26).

Such a transference of the words (*ἰδοὺ . . . ἐντὸς*) will seem an intolerable expedient to all but those who accept the generally futurist sense of the section taken as a whole. Everything depends upon reading that section deliberately, and asking oneself whether it can be divided in purpose.

I think myself that the futurist character belongs to the whole section, in spite of the fact that the beginning (vv. 20-21) belongs to a conversation with Pharisees, and the rest (vv. 22-27) to the instruction of Disciples. It has been argued that the Pharisees are the last people to whom it could be said that the Kingdom was within or among them. I am not sure that the argument is safe. It is also reasonable to suppose that the Pharisees, habitually looking for external religious events, were the proper recipients of teaching about a Kingdom within the heart or hidden in Israel.

But this suggestion does not relieve us of difficulty if *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* really does mean not "publicly" but "secretly." If this is so we are led again to recognize the unity of teaching in the whole section, and to some fresh attribution of *ἰδοὺ γὰρ . . . ἐντὸς*, or else to a somewhat different interpretation of the words.

The two verses might teach that the Kingdom cometh not in such a way that (neither shall they say, "Here, there,") it must be carefully sought out. It will be plain to see, for already the Kingdom that is to come exists among us, and we might already see it and learn its nature and laws. Those who begin now to see it (John iii. 3) will not fail to know when it comes. But such a reading is difficult.

We who are unalterably attached to the idea of a Kingdom founded afresh in the Incarnation, established in power at the Cross, and not only destined to come at "the End," but already growing in the growing allegiance of wills to God—those who are most jealous of any infringe-

ment upon this conception, or any separation of the Christian hope from "common" human life and real social improvement, will be the most careful not to support or illustrate their belief with a text which may not be appropriate to this part of the truth, but to that other coming described by prophetic history in such words as "At midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh," and "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory . . . then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory."

The present work of Grace in the Church is, in the deepest sense, one with the work of Christ at His coming. The glow of love in mortal hearts belongs to the one fire from heaven, and if it increases, is it not because our salvation is nearer than when first we believed? What seems to grow from below always descends from above. I believe that there is an imperishable truth in the prediction, "We shall meet the Lord in the air"; and that the mortal life raised by the Spirit, and in the growing exercise of human will released by Christ, towards the height of freedom and righteousness, is destined to be met and welcomed by the very Love descending "from heaven," which has animated all the Godward pilgrimage of the world.

But still we speak in terms too low of Christ's coming when we speak of it as accomplished; and we then empty of meaning such words as these, addressed to Israelites in Solomon's Porch by St. Peter (Acts iii. 19-21): "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord; and that he may send the Christ who had been appointed for you, even Jesus: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things. . . ."

P. N. Waggett.

LITURGICA

"LA VIE ET LES ARTS LITURGIQUES"

August to December, 1923.

This periodical continues to be as enlightening and suggestive as our summary of the first seven numbers for 1923 indicated (see November, pp. 287 *f.*). If occasionally some of the matters discussed and the advice given seem to us rather unimportant—especially under the heading *Questions et Réponses* (*e.g.*, whether a sash or girdle should be worn at Mass, how many statues should be placed in a church, etc.)—the same might, no doubt, be said of our own Church weeklies, though our French contemporary enters into such subjects much more thoroughly and solemnly than its English equivalents. That, however, allowing for the different standpoint from which the devout and studious Roman Catholic considers public worship and its accessories, is the only adverse criticism we would offer.

In all directions these five numbers give evidence that the Roman Catholic Church, not only in France, but in other countries, is, as a whole, alive and ready, when permitted by authority, to make fresh experiments (which in some cases take the form of revivals of older practices), as well as anxious to study and understand the past, and not to break continuity with it. Here one of the most informing articles is that signed L. Gt., which gives a general survey of *La Liturgie à l'Étranger* in November,

pp. 40-46. It takes account of what is being done, especially by the younger generation, in Holland, Germany, and Rome, while several movements it mentions are more fully illustrated in separate articles—*e.g.*, that (again signed L. Gt.) on "*Ecclesia Orans*" (September), the outcome of the liturgical activities of the Abbey of Maria-Laach in Germany. These seem largely in the direction of a sympathetic study of and willingness to benefit by both the pagan cults and the Christian services of the East; and of the latter we find other evidences—*e.g.*, in reviews of Raymond Janin's *Les Églises orientales et les Rites orientaux*, and of G. R. Woodward's *Hymns of the Greek Church ;* this is obviously a much more hopeful tendency than that which has hitherto prevailed of imposing Western Catholicism upon the West by means of "Uniat" Churches.

Exigencies of space require that we should pass over without comment many matters brought forward, and discuss more or less fully such as the interesting experiments of the *cultoris martyrum* and the *Collegium Tarcisii* at Rome, and of the celebration of *Messes dialoguées ;* the efforts and action of the *Groupe des Écrivains et des Artistes Catholiques* to fulfil their duties to the Church; the due prominence given to the Mozarabic rite among the subjects discussed at the *Congrès des Sciences* at Salamanca last June; the *Atelier d'Art sacré*, founded by Maurice Denis, and directed by him in conjunction with M. Georges Desvallières for the past three years, etc. Church music still occupies considerable attention. A. Gastoné (in October) has a learned article on *Les Primitifs Français* in that art (with musical illustrations rather difficult for the *un*-learned to appreciate !), and in December we are given the programme of the *Institut Grégorien* recently founded in Paris, together with a Pastoral Letter from the Archbishop (Cardinal Dubois), in which he describes its aims and scope.

Lastly, among other "liturgical arts," attention is paid to that of Church architecture: (1) There is an article (the third of a series) on the *Mobilier et Accessoires* of the Cathedral of Amiens, in which Georges Durand deals faithfully with such monstrosities of the eighteenth century as the immense *gloire aux rayons dorés, entremelés de nuages et d'anges joufflus* over the high-altar, while showing proper appreciation of the far better, earlier work; (2) L. G. Willenborg describes the new Church of St. Joseph at Noordhoek, in Holland, of which Dom P. Bellot (of the Abbey of Oosterhout) was the architect: the two pictures given show how he has struck out a new line in the use of coloured bricks and several unconventional designs, which are probably very effective in their way.

Sed manum de tabula : much else must be left entirely unmentioned. Perhaps some of our readers will be sufficiently tantalized by these glances and omissions, to consult the journal itself: they will not be disappointed.

C. L. Feltoe.

REVIEWS

SOME ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX THOUGHT. By the Rev. Frank Gavin. Professor of New Testament, Nashotah, Wisconsin. The Hale Lectures for 1922. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

Professor Gavin has conferred a real boon on English Church-people by making accessible the teaching of the chief Greek theologians of the present day. These lectures may be said to consist in an exposition of the teaching of Androutsos, criticized very freely and frankly by the dogmatic treatises of Mesilora, Dyobounistes and Balanos. It is perfectly true, as the lecturer says, that these great theologians are practically unknown to the English-speaking world. Of Androutsos, perhaps the most distinguished and learned of them all, Professor Gavin speaks in tokens of great admiration. His work on dogma is "brilliantly written, concise, lucid, fearless, and alive to difficulties, which are always faced and never shirked or summarily disposed of" (p. xxv). Androutsos, however, was bitterly attacked by Dyobounistes and Balanos. For there are different schools of thought among the Orthodox.

Professor Gavin is one of the first to do justice in English to the Roman writer Palmieri's splendid work, *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa*, with its profound knowledge of the Russian Church. It is very high praise to speak of a book as being conspicuous for "breadth of view, exhaustiveness of treatment, sympathy, and comprehension," to say that it is "animated by the best spirit of honesty and fairness, seeking always to find grounds of agreement rather than points of difference between the Orthodox and Roman teaching" (p. 52). But readers of Palmieri will, I think, agree that this high praise is no exaggeration. And one must rejoice to find this well-deserved tribute generously given by so competent an authority as Professor Gavin. It is much to find the conclusion reached that "Anglo-Catholic, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox agree fundamentally in the way all three conceive of the history of Revelation and the progress of Christian doctrine" (p. 54). "St. Vincent of Lerins," we are told, "enjoys quite as high a position among Orthodox as among Western theologians" (p. 54). At the same time, Palmieri naturally, as a Roman, draws inferences in favour of the Papal development on which Professor Gavin is constrained to remark, "with his conclusions neither Orthodox nor Anglican can agree."

The general scheme of these six lectures on the Hale founda-

tion is (1) Prolegomena on Dogma, etc.; (2) the Doctrine of God; (3) Sin and Salvation; (4) Doctrine of Grace and of the Church; (5) Doctrine of the Sacraments; (6) The Last Things.

The part to which Anglicans naturally look at the present time is the Orthodox doctrine of the Church and its bearing on the prospects of Reunion.

According to the doctrine of the Eastern Church, the Church was created by Christ, built by Him on the Apostles as foundations. The Apostles constituted the Bishops as their successors. The Bishop is the centre of spiritual authority in the local Church, and the indispensable condition of the Church's existence. "The Bishops differ from the Apostles only in name" (p. 247). "The only true and genuine Catholic Church is the Orthodox Eastern Church" (p. 251). "They are certainly convinced that the Roman Church is not a part of the Catholic Church" (p. 252). The Eastern Church regards itself as being, since the Schism nine hundred years ago, "the only true and natural continuation of the undivided Church" (p. 253). If the Orthodox Church claims to be the Catholic Church, and the only possessor of infallibility, it can recognize no branches or sections of the Church (p. 259). There can be only one Church founded by our Lord, and in that Church there can be but one single Faith. This one Church is the Orthodox Church; the one Faith is the whole Orthodox doctrine (p. 259). The Protestant theory is altogether wrong. The Roman theory is wrong. The Anglo-Catholic theory is wrong. The Orthodox Church alone is the true Church created by Christ.

No distinction appears to be made by the adherents to these doctrines between outward and inward unity; between unity of constitution and unity of belief. There is only one Church, and that Church cannot apparently sustain division. It must be a unified and unique organic whole.

This standpoint is certainly uncompromising enough, and seems to render all hope of corporate reunion impossible. But in spite of this apparent impossibility, the theologians of the Eastern Church have discovered a way of escape. They say that while strictly speaking (κατ' ἀκρίβειαν) the Orthodox Church can recognize no sacraments which it has not itself conferred, yet it is able to regard the sacraments conferred by the Communions in an indulgent way (κατ' οἰκονομίαν). It can deviate from its natural strictness of judgment on sacraments conferred outside its own limits. It has the power and the right to acknowledge their validity (p. 262). Thus the Orthodox Church is able to recognize Baptism and other sacraments conferred by any community of Christian people. This is technically known as the method of economy. "It is im-

possible," says Professor Gavin, "to discover the principle governing the use of 'economy' in this matter, nor is there a *rationale* to determine the exercise of economy in any given case." There is no denying the fact that in the past the attitude of the Easterns toward Roman Catholic sacraments has varied from recognition to rejection at different times. These variations present no difficulty to the Eastern mind, which views them as equally within the Church's right. Nor is it the least disturbed by inconsistency. It is clear that circumstances alter cases.

On the subject of Anglican Orders we should be grateful for a much fuller account of Greek opinion than Professor Gavin has provided. The opinion of Androutsos, originally published in 1903, has been accessible to English readers since its translation in 1909. It was cautious, but on the whole favourable. But Professor Gavin evidently thinks that the Greek theologians' opinion would have been more favourable had he not laboured under "considerable ignorance of the facts about the English Church." He even goes so far as to say that Androutsos' latest statement on the subject "is a standing example of the futility of obtaining facts second-hand. Androutsos' information is derived from Germany" (p. 302 n.). The theologian Mesilora contended that the Anglican Church "rejects the Sacrament of Orders as conveying special grace." Its orders, therefore, "cannot be recognized as valid" (p. 303). That was published in 1904. Dyobounistes complained of Anglican "inconsistency and indefiniteness," and held that the problem of Anglican Orders can only be settled satisfactorily and certainly when the episcopal Church shall define officially its teaching on Holy Orders and the sacraments in general. Professor Komnenos, on the other hand, the most recent writer on the subject, says that "the reserved attitude of our Church towards Anglican Orders is altogether unreasonable. . . . We are of unhesitating opinion that the same rule (as applies to Roman Catholics) ought to be applied to the Anglican clergy, inasmuch as they also are demonstrated . . to have received not the semblance of ordination but one which is real, and is based upon . . . historic succession from the Apostles, upon its canonical transmission, and upon an essentially and fundamentally right conception of it" (p. 313).

All these quotations are given by Professor Gavin. But unfortunately he stops there. He does not go on to show the remarkable change which has passed over the Greek attitude toward the Anglican. He does, indeed, refer in a footnote to the pronouncement made by the Patriarch Meletios in July, 1922, but for some reason or other does not quote it. Nor is any mention made of the important and celebrated Encyclical

of Constantinople of the same period. The consequence is that, whereas in fact the relation of the Orthodox Church to the Anglican has passed altogether beyond the stage of doubtfulness and hesitation, this is unhappily not the impression which the author's pages suggest. Hence this part of the lecture presents rather a remoteness from existing circumstances, and seems to dwell on conditions which have mercifully passed away. No doubt in a future edition Professor Gavin will be anxious to remedy this omission.

What is before the minds of Anglicans concerned for Reunion is not the opinion of any individual Greek theologian concerning the Anglican position, but rather such documents as the declaration of the Patriarch Meletios that "the Holy Synod . . . has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal confession of Bishops, priests, and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the orthodox point of view for the recognition of the *Charisma* of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession."

There is a great deal of valuable knowledge to be obtained from Professor Gavin's learned analysis of Greek teaching.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

Apollinarianism: An Essay on the Christology of the Early Church. By Charles E. Raven, D.D. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

A tutor in theology is accustomed to finding that many of his pupils, when they first begin to reflect on their religious beliefs, give an Apollinarian account of Christ and have their interest quickened by the discovery that that is neither satisfactory nor orthodox. He is also familiar with pupils whose religion has been born of devotion to "the man Christ Jesus," and who are anxious to think out what is involved in the claim which they acknowledge Him to have on their lives. In the opening chapters of his book, Dr. Raven shows well how the early Church, in passing from religious belief to that reflection upon it which constitutes theology, anticipated the progress of individual Christians to-day. He is, perhaps, inclined too readily to accept words like "evolution" as an explanation of this development, and to minimize the importance of hard thought; but, nevertheless, this part of his work is a welcome contribution to the popularizing of this true view of the historical formulation of Christian doctrine.

Dr. Raven is also to be congratulated on his accounts of the controversies preceding the Apollinarian, and on his exegesis of the Laodicene himself. Here patient industry and lucid exposition present very valuable fruits of research. In his clearing Apollinarius of the charge of teaching that Christ's flesh was consubstantial with the Father, in his arguments that he was throughout consistently trichotomite in his psychology, in his exposition of the *communicatio idiomatum*, and in his disentangling of the real point of the Apollinarian heresy, Dr. Raven's work deserves high praise. It must necessarily become the standard account of the great heretic for English-reading students of doctrine.

This being so, it is unfortunate that in other directions the book is not equally satisfactory. It combines with the exposition of Apollinarius a vigorous and sustained attack on Catholic orthodoxy as being itself Apollinarian.* We have not space here to investigate the comparatively unimportant question of the reputations of particular writers, and must leave Athanasius, Cyril, and Dr. Bright to speak for themselves. But on the main question at issue some points may briefly be suggested for consideration.

Dr. Raven's attack has two main objectives: the doctrine of Christ's " impersonal manhood " and the " Greek " conception of God. The former is assumed to be necessarily Apollinarian, and to be the inevitable result of the latter.

With regard to the question of Christ's " impersonal manhood," we cannot do better than quote the following terse statement from a letter by Dr. T. A. Lacey, printed in *The Guardian* for December 23, 1921:

> From Locke's definition of " person " as " a thinking intelligent being that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself," modern psychology has proceeded in a fairly regular course to identify " personality " as the potentiality of self-consciousness, or, more precisely, of conscious activity.
>
> The *persona* of Latin theology, as defined by Boetius, would certainly have this quality of self-consciousness, but would not be constituted by it. Thus St. Thomas Aquinas, following the definition, was able to say that a discarnate soul, which he held to be self-conscious, is not *persona*. It is a nuisance when terms of art or science thus take a new meaning, but it cannot be helped. Only one must walk warily in using them. As thus:
>
> 1. When the Council of Chalcedon taught that our Lord is but one *hypostasis* (Latinized as *persona*), and that Divine, it is extremely improbable that there was any reference to personality as understood

* According to pp. 233 (footnote) and 288, the Church has also adopted the teaching of Nestorius, but these are mere passing allusions, in which Dr. Raven assumes the fact as proved, without turning aside to discuss it.

in modern psychology. If there was not, the dogmatic definition does not preclude the supposition of a " human personality " in our Lord.

2. When the Council proceeded to attribute to our Lord two natures —Divine and human—it is at least possible that " human nature " was taken as including all that is now called " personality." In that case, the Council implicitly affirmed the " human personality " of our Lord.

3. When the sixth General Council, in the year 680, affirmed, as against the Monothelites, that there were in our Lord two wills and two *energeiai*—Divine and human—it seems fairly clear that the human *energeia* (Latinized as *operatio*) corresponds closely to that " conscious activity " which is the basis of the modern idea of personality. Therefore, what may have been implicit in the definition of Chalcedon now becomes explicit. The Council definitely attributes to our Lord " human personality " in the modern sense of the words.

Dr. Raven seems to ignore not merely the historical problems connected with the development of the idea of personality, but also the philosophical difficulties involved in the conception. For example, his confident language about freedom on pp. 280 and 288 may be contrasted with the more cautious approach to the subject of Baron von Hügel, who says:

> . . . the conviction that the possibility of Evil arises, not from Freedom as such, but from the Imperfection of the human kind of freedom—the liberty of Choice. Quite a number of my younger High Anglican friends have on this point, with the best of motives, sacrificed, I believe, the deeper insight to the pressure of popular apologetic. In the long run, however, the more difficult view, if indeed it be the truer, will undoubtedly prevail.*

Dr. Raven apparently ranges himself alongside of the Baron's " younger High Anglican friends," and consequently is unable to face the question whether there may not be a freedom which is open to temptation but incapable of sin.

But it is in connection with the idea of Godhead that he is most open to criticism. There is one passage, indeed, in which he shows appreciation of the problems involved:

> The first of these is the fundamental question, if the Godhead be changeless, how can God become incarnate at all ? does not Incarnation, if it affects the Godhead in any way, imply change ? In its widest aspect this is the same old problem of the relationship of the one to the many, the static to the kinetic, the eternal to the temporal, which has occupied Greek thought from its beginning, and which every Theist must admit and explain.†

This statement of the problem is wholly admirable, but unfortunately, so far from going on to " admit and explain " it, Dr. Raven runs away from it, pours scorn on " human logic,"‡ and ranges himself with the obscurantists by giving

* *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, p. xi. See also p. 17, and compare the treatment there of St. Augustine with that of Dr. Raven on p. 283.

† P. 201. ‡ P. 33.

as his answer an appeal to the authority of the Fourth Gospel.* This insistence that the philosophical problems of the Christian faith are to be solved by a re-affirmation of the faith which gives rise to them is a demand for the "sacrifice of the intellect" which no theologian can rightly admit. If again we may refer to Baron von Hügel, his language about the "divine simultaneity" as contrasted with "human successiveness,"† however difficult of comprehension, does at least show a mind attempting to unravel the real knot and refusing to cut it. Dr. Raven attempts to justify his avoiding the issue by asserting that it is a real issue only for Greek thought, and dismissing Greek thought as materialistic. In this he contradicts his statement that the issue is one to be faced by "every Theist," and uses language about Greek thought to which one may search in vain for a parallel in such a work as Professor Webb's *Gifford Lectures*.

The real difficulties of the Christian faith are not peculiar to that faith, but are the difficulties in the universe as we find it. The intellectual greatness of the Christian faith lies in the fact that those difficulties reappear within it, and any attempt to simplify the faith by avoiding them must lead ultimately to discrediting the Christian philosophy of life. The fundamental problem of the universe for philosophy is the relation of the temporal to the eternal. Absolutists or monists are inclined to underestimate the importance of the temporal; Bergsonians or progressists‡ that of the eternal. The Christian doctrine of creation, of divine "transcendence and immanence," is an attempt to give due recognition to either aspect of reality. Now, any doctrine of creation must involve self-limitation on the part of God, and so passibility, for passibility means simply limitation. No God, therefore, can be adequate for the religion of dwellers in this puzzling universe unless we distinguish within Him God-in-Himself (so to speak), and God-in-relation-to-creation, acknowledging the necessity of both aspects and yet the unity of God. The strength of the Christian position lies in the fact that to deny this leads ultimately to the suicide of thought.

The Fathers, then, should not be called upon to abandon belief in God's impassibility. The cause of their Christological difficulty lay rather in their tendency to forget the implications of the doctrine of creation, which should have reminded them that it was God-in-relation-to-creation who became incarnate, God who was passible in the sense, for example, of being "afflicted with the afflictions of His people," and could there-

* Pp. 2, 10, 272, 298.
† *Op. cit.*, pp. 89, 94, 215.
‡ I owe this word to Mr. F. H. Brabant, of Wadham College.

fore undergo also the limitations of incarnate passibility.* Moreover, there is work to be done, which is much needed, in investigating how far the Fathers were hampered by their conception of manhood. We have seen that the idea of personality has been much developed, if not radically transformed, since patristic times, and he would be a bold man to-day who would claim to be able to give a satisfactory answer to the question: "What is meant by the self?" One may hazard the suggestion that in so far as the difficulty of the Fathers was due to their statement of the problem of the Incarnation as that of the union of two οὐσίαι, Godhead and manhood, in the one Person of Christ, it was not their "Greek idea" of Godhead which was chiefly at fault, but their assumption that manhood is an οὐσία on a level, so to speak, with the οὐσία of God. Perhaps it is in Christ alone that true manhood has ever existed; perhaps in feeling after a distinction between His manhood and ours, and in stating that distinction by calling His "impersonal," they were making what may yet turn out to be the most fertile contribution to psychology in patristic thought.

Few things are more to be desired than a thinking out anew of the Christian faith in the light of such considerations as have briefly been suggested. It would require a thinker who combined the patient patristic research and historical knowledge of Dr. Raven with a knowledge of philosophy and an insight into philosophic problems of which none of his hitherto published works give sufficient evidence. LEONARD HODGSON.

* *Note.*—Patripassianism is not the ascription of any passibility whatever to the Father (that is involved in creation); but of such passibility as is consequent upon incarnation.

NOTICES

THE UNIATE EASTERN CHURCHES. By Adrian Fortescue. Edited by Dr. George D. Smith. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

This work was planned by its learned author a year or two before his lamented death to form a supplementary volume to his two earlier works on the Eastern Church (*The Orthodox Eastern Church* and *The Lesser Eastern Churches*). Unfortunately the book was never finished, but we have here the most valuable portion (though not the largest), as the author has already written about Chaldeans, Syrians, and Armenians in his second volume. Part I. deals with the Byzantine Uniates—the Italo-Greeks and the existing Byzantine institutions in Italy at the present time. The Uniate Churches east of Constantinople are not included in this volume.

However, what we have here is of great interest to all students. The Italo-Greeks described are the inhabitants of Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, who use the Byzantine rite. They are three different races—there is the old remnant of Greek-speaking inhabitants of Lower Italy, together with some Albanians, and the immigrants from the Levant. The existence of this body of people will be a surprise to some readers of this book. There were Greek colonies here before the Christian era, and as early as the ninth century B.C. The Greeks wandered far and wide and planted colonies around the Mediterranean shores. Augustus (31 B.C. to A.D. 14) sent Roman colonists to Sicily, and they brought with them the Latin language; but long after the Roman power had been established, the people remained Greek, and the Greek element never died out. When the centre of the Empire was moved to Constantinople these people looked with more readiness to its new home, for they found themselves under the rule of men of their own language. In the second century there were flourishing Christian communities all over Southern Italy and Sicily all using the Greek Liturgy. This is not surprising, for in Rome up to the middle of the third century Greek was the language of the Liturgy. But the rites used in Southern Italy and Sicily were not Roman; it is difficult to say what they were. They could not have been Byzantine in the first four or five centuries, for the Byzantine rite was not formed until the eighth century. It must have been one of the many Greek forms gradually shaping itself into a permanent type, and akin to that of Antioch. From the eleventh century to the fifteenth the Byzantine rite almost expired; it received new life with the arrival of Albanian refugees. But during the later Middle Ages the rite, although seldom heard in parish churches, was kept alive in the Basilian monasteries.

In the chapter on " Existing Byzantine Institutions " there is a most fascinating account of the Greek monastery at Grottoferrata, of which scores of English visitors to Rome have never heard. Here, situated on the Campagna, a few miles from the Eternal City, is a veritable Greek Laura founded by Neilos (or Nilos) in the tenth century. It is a picturesque building with ramparts and towers, standing amidst vineyards and olive groves. It has been used many times for military purposes in petty wars, and was sacked by the soldiers of the Avignon Pope during the Western Schism.

Much is made of the fact that the Popes have maintained, in the heart of the Papal States, a foreign rite, which they could have swept away any moment; but did not do so because of a laudable desire to retain Easterns

within their fold. Many times there had been attempts to Latinize this monastery, but such efforts were always frustrated by the large-heartedness of the Popes. We are told of "much Latin infiltration" in the Byzantine rite and that "it is all done away now." In 1881 Leo XIII. ordered the restoration of the Byzantine rite in its pure form. Grottoferrata means a great deal to Dr. Fortescue; "it is always a standing witness that to be a Catholic does not mean giving up the venerable rites of the East." This may be so, but H. F. Tozer told us in 1889 that he found many Greek villages in Southern Italy and Sicily where the Church services had long been in Latin. Vannutelli, who visited this district in the same year, says that the Greek rite was abolished by a Franciscan bishop, Matteo Saraceno, except on certain days of the year. It is the more interesting, then, to find the ancient rite retained in its purity at Grottoferrata.

We greatly respect the author's enthusiasm for the Eastern Church, but doubt if every Uniate body represents the old Eastern Church from which they separated before they made submission to Rome; many members of the original bodies would not now recognize their own rites as at present used by the Uniate Churches. Take the case of the Uniate Chaldeans: their churches have been westernized, their Syriac Liturgy altered in form, and their daily service book greatly revised. It is true that they are now in communion with Rome, but that did not take place until the middle of the sixteenth century, and the larger part of the people have never followed their Uniate brethren. Every traveller in the Near East admires the good work done for the Chaldean Uniates by the R.C. Missions in the matter of education, but the writer of these lines knows many Uniates intimately and is aware that the link that binds them to Rome is not the full acceptance of the Papal claims, but the desire for political protection and the advantage of a good European education, which Rome does so admirably.

Dr. Fortescue's zeal for the Uniate Churches leads him to say three times over that "they save the situation"—that is, a Uniate may be a Catholic in communion with Rome without accepting the use of the Roman rite. The words may be prophetic. We think the fact that the whole Eastern Church is Catholic without being in communion with the Holy See may yet "save the situation" and help the whole Church to accept the Pope as the Patriarch of the West without being compelled to acknowledge his primacy and supremacy as *jure divino*. The book contains an excellent bibliography.

F. N. Heazell.

Christian Beliefs and Modern Questions. By Oliver C. Quick. S.C.M. 4s.

The volume before us consists of lectures given in preparation for the North Tyneside Church Crusade. It is a popular treatment of Christian beliefs for the modern mind, and the Canon asks us to judge it by what it contains rather than by what it omits. We have found nothing in it of an original character, and little which cannot be found with greater or less elaboration in numerous modern little books and magazine articles. No doubt Mr. Quick's contribution will serve admirably the purpose for which it is published, and it is the kind of thing we should recommend the layman to read who is "unaccustomed to and unattracted by ordinary theological speculation." We venture earnestly to hope, however, that

Canon Quick will not allow these diversions into the realm of "popular" theology to distract him from what we think should be his main task, and that for which both his favoured ecclesiastical position and his undoubted talents qualify him—viz., a solid contribution of real and permanent worth to the philosophical treatment of theology. H. M. RELTON.

IN AND AROUND THE BOOK OF DANIEL. By Charles Boutflower, M.A. London: S.P.C.K. 1923. 16s.

Canon Liddon in his Bampton Lectures refers to a then (1867) recent description of the Book of Daniel as "a battle-field of the Old Testament." Then, no doubt, it was so, and many a hard knock was given and received upon that field. Since then we have been taught to think of the battle as over, and of the book rather as a cemetery where the ashes of now forgotten controversy lie buried. If any question of Biblical criticism was settled, surely it was the date of Daniel. It came from Maccabean times and there was the end of it. To put it in the sixth century B.C. was to run into all manner of historical, linguistic, and theological difficulties.

Here, however, in 1923 we have a book which raises the controversy anew. It is a book that must be reckoned with; it is the work of a man who knows his subject, and is able also to state his opinions clearly. These opinions are utterly contrary to those at present in fashion.

What can he say, it will be asked, about all the many difficulties? What about the Chaldeans, the "Four Kingdoms," the Greek words, Nebuchadnezzar's madness, Darius the Mede? Why, there is a difficulty in every one of the first five chapters, not to speak of the "Seventy Weeks" or the pretended prophecy about Antiochus in the later chapters.

Anyone who is inclined so to question will find all these points discussed and the traditional view maintained on every single one. The "consensus" of scholars does not frighten the author, and he is as sure of the accuracy of his views as they are of theirs. Perhaps both sides are a little too certain. The hardest of all lessons is to "teach our tongues to say 'I do not know.'"

Take, for example, the "Four Kingdoms." The usual modern view is that the last three are the Median, the Persian, and the Greek; and that the "little horn" (chaps. vii. and viii.) is always Antiochus. Mr. Boutflower makes Rome the "iron" kingdom, the two preceding being the Greek and the Medo-Persian, and the "little horn" having a different meaning in each chapter. Neither scheme is free from difficulty. How can the Medes and Persians be separated? They certainly are not in the Book of Daniel. In chap. v. 28 it is said to Belshazzar, "Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians." We must not say the Persians are an afterthought, for, as all agree, there is play between *peres* and Persians. This on one side, and on the other the "little horn" of chap. viii. seems to refer back to that of chap. vii. There is something to be said for a third scheme, which avoids both these difficulties, that the "Four" are the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Syrian.

One of the weakest parts of the book is the author's fanciful attempt to show that gold, silver, brass, and iron suitably represent the kingdoms of the "Roman" scheme. One of his arguments actually is that "brass" points to the Greeks because words compounded with χαλχός occupy five columns in Liddell and Scott and those compounded with σίδηρος only one and three-quarter columns!

" The great historical crux of the book is Darius the Mede " (p. 142). He was, the author maintains, Cambyses, the Son of Cyrus, who was associated with his father as King of Babylon. Many tablets are referred to in which Cambyses is called " King of Babylon." This is decisive for him against Gobryas. Darius is an appellative, and he is called a Mede because he was the Son of a Median mother. The Ahasuerus of chap. ix. 1 is not Xerxes, but a Mede named Ahasuerus. The difficulty as to the age of Darius is got over by assuming a mistake in the transcription of old Hebrew letters used as numerals, whereby " sixty-two " was written instead of " twelve." There would seem to be too many conjectures here to justify the certainty with which these statements are made.

In discussing the problem of the " Seventy Weeks " Mr. Boutflower makes 457 B.C. his *terminus a quo*. We may let this stand, though something might be said against it. From this to A.D. 33 is 490 years (seventy weeks). St. Stephen was martyred in A.D. 33. " The popularity of the new faith among the masses lasted down to his death, but no longer." This is how the words " He shall make a firm covenant with the many for one week " are interpreted. But what ground for certainty has the author that St. Stephen was martyred in A.D. 33. If it was a year before or a year after, it would, from his point of view, affect the accuracy of the prophecy. The *terminus ad quem* seems arbitrarily chosen to suit the conditions of the problem.

One of the strongest proofs of a Maccabean date for *Daniel* has always been seen in the fact that, whereas the earlier part of Antiochus' relations with Egypt and Palestine are accurately set forth in chap. xi., the distinctness ceases after the period of persecution, and the account becomes inaccurate. Mr. Boutflower, following Dr. C. H. H. Wright, explains this by considering chap. xi. as a kind of targum or paraphrase afterwards inserted in the text. We need not quarrel with this. It is a possible explanation. Certainly critics who find interpolations throughout the whole Old Testament have no right to complain when similar assumptions are made in answer to them.

Near the close there are two important chapters on the language of the book. On this question Driver's dictum is well known:

> " The Persian words *presuppose* a period after the Persian Empire had been well established; the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits* a date *after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great*."

Mr. Boutflower refuses to accept this as a proper statement of the facts. Arguing chiefly from the similarity of the Aramaic in *Daniel* to that of the Elephantiné papyri, he propounds, touching that portion of the book, an opposite dictum (p. 240), that *the Aramaic permits a date as early as the closing years of the prophet Daniel.*

Again (p. 241), he writes:

> " These Persian and Greek words, so far from presenting any real difficulty, supply most valuable evidence, alike as to the authenticity of the Book, and as to the position occupied by its writer."

Daniel, he argues, wrote in Aramaic, a language which was full of loan-words, and had long been in contact with Old Persian; he wrote at a Persian court, where he conversed in Persian every day. This seems sound enough.

Then as to the Greek words, *his* dictum is (p. 246):

> "*It is the fewness of the Greek words, coupled with the fact that they are only the names of musical instruments, that must prove fatal to the critics' theory that the Book was written in* 165 B.C."

This dictum is supported by solid arguments too lengthy to mention here, and the writer sums up (p. 257) not unfairly from his point of view:

> "Viewed from the linguistic standpoint there is no Book of the Old Testament which bears more clearly the stamp of its age than this Book of Daniel."

It is a pity that in the Appendix on pp. 258-267 there are so many small inaccuracies. The same word is transliterated differently—the Old Persian equivalent for ποτί is given as *pati, atiy,* and *patiy;* the word for "tribute" as *baji* and *bajiy; fratera-ka,* p. 259, is given as *frateraka* elsewhere (p. 244). There are several mistakes in the pointing and transliteration of Aramaic words. Even the Greek is not faultless. On p. 260 occurs the extraordinary word ῥήμασις, and γραμματέα is apparently taken as a nominative; on p. 264 we have φώς for φῶς.

It need be no matter for surprise that Mr. Boutflower has been able to collect many facts which tell against Driver's dictum about the language of Daniel. It was, perhaps, the weakest of his arguments. There is another much more telling argument on which the present book does not touch, the argument, namely, that we find certain theological ideas (angels, the Resurrection, the world-judgment) more fully developed than elsewhere in the Old Testament. The omission of discussion on these points is matter for regret.

We have to thank the author for both instruction and pleasure derived from many hours' study of his book. He is wrong in many places, we believe, but he has again and again, far oftener than we have had space to indicate, accumulated facts which render it possible that the book in its essential parts comes from a date far earlier than it has been of late the fashion to assign to it.

J. M. HARDEN.

THREE MEASURES OF MEAL. A Study in Religion. By F. G. Vial. Oxford Press. 10s. 6d.

Christianity is the leaven; the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin societies in which it was embedded the three measures of meal. Practically every problem of Christianity and the ancient world is touched upon in the course of this book. Non-specialist readers who want a bird's-eye view of many problems will enjoy Mr. Vial's pleasantly written pages. Those who prefer a more thorough treatment of a great theme will be inclined to agree with the author when, disarming criticism, he says: "I realize that I have essayed a task which is beyond my powers." Notes like the following are out of place in a work of scholarship. "The above sentence is a reminiscence of a striking passage contained in an article by J. H. A. Hart upon Philo, which appeared in the *Journal of Theological Studies,* 1909 (January ?). If I remember rightly, the article was in the form of a review of a work on Philo by Émile Bréhier" (p. 53). Or this: "I forget who says this, but . . ." (p. 143).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER